DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 428 JC 740 241

TITLE	Program Review Committee Report on Community Colleges in the State of Connecticut (and Summary).
INSTITUTION	Connecticut State General Assembly, Hartford. Program Review Committee.
PUB DATE	Jul 74
NOTE	146p.
AVAILABLE FROM	George L. Schroeder, Director, Program Review Committee, Room 402, State Capitol, Hartford, Connecticut 06115
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$6.60 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	College Administration; *Community Colleges; Educational Legislation; Governance; Research Committees; *State Action; State Boards of Education; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

Both the report of the Program Review Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly on the state's community colleges and a summary of that report are provided. The report of findings and recommendations for action were made following a 6-month study involving on-site visits to all 12 community colleges; interviews with all the college presidents, members of the governing bodies, faculty, students, and a few employers; a public hearing; and a review of community college literature. Chapters deal with the history of community colleges, governance of the state system, autonomy and expenditure controls, missions of regional community colleges, accomplishment of the mission, method of funding, open enrollment, faculty, health services, day care, facilities, and individual community colleges. A letter from the chairman of the governing board of the Connecticut community colleges, in response to the draft report, is appended. (KM)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 093428

JC 740 241

Connecticut General Assembly

Program Review Committee
Report On
Community Colleges In The State Of Connecticut

July, 1974

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE MEMBERS	HOUSE MEMBERS
Dave Odegard, Co-Chairman	John Groppo, Co-Chairman
J. Edward Caldwell	Ernest Burnham, Jr.
Thomas Carruthers	Robert Carragher
Joseph Lieberman	Albert Cretella, Jr.
Romeo G. Petroni	George Hannon, Jr.
William Strada, Jr.	Astrid Hanzalek

COMMITTEE STAFF

Director, George L. Schroeder

Senior Research Analyst, S. Henry Kaplan

Research Analyst, Mary K. Leonard

Research Analyst, David J. Novack

Secretary/Research Assistant, Candy Barton

Editorial Consultant, Lynne E. Schroeder, University of Connecticut Publication Editor

Previous Reports:

Secondary Vocational Education in Connecticut, March, 1974

Land Acquisition by the State of Connecticut, Sept., 1973

Special Education in Connecticut, April, 1972

Connecticut General Assembly

SENATE MEMBERS
DAVE ODEGARD
CO-CHAIRMAN
J. EDWARD CALDWELL
THOMAS CARRUTHERS
JOSEPH LIEBERMAN
ROMEO G. PETRONI
WILLIAM STRADA

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
ROOM 402, STATE CAPITOL
HARTFORD, CONN. 06115
(203) 566-4843

HOUSE MEMBERS
JOHN GROPPO
CO-CHAIRMAN
ERNEST BURNHAM
ROBERT CARRAGHER
ALBERT CRETELLA
GEORGE HANNON
ASTRID HANZALEK
GEORGE L. SCHROEDER
DIRECTOR

July, 1974

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

TO: THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The members of the Program Review Committee are pleased to submit their Report on Community Colleges in the State of Connecticut to the members of the General Assembly.

The Committee believes that this report presents an unbiased, comprehensive picture of community college programs and their administration. We have pointed out both the successes and failures of the system in an attempt to illustrate to the members of the General Assembly a course of action which should be taken to improve educational opportunities in Connecticut. The Committee believes that the community colleges provide the student with a wide range of valuable educational experiences and hopes that their vital role in Connecticut education will continue to be recognized as worthy of our efforts toward improvement.

The Program Review Committee hopes that this Report will provide a primary basis for these efforts.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Odegard
Senator Dave Odegard
Co-Chairman

John G Groppo
Representative John Groppo
Co-Chairman

Table of Contents

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

INTRODUCTION..... 1

I. HISTORY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES..... 5
Community Colleges in the United States..... 5
Community Colleges in Connecticut..... 8

II. GOVERNANCE OF THE STATE SYSTEM OF REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES..... 11
The First Level - Indirect Governance..... 11
The Second Level - The Commission for Higher Education..... 13
The Third Level - Line Agencies and Direct Administration..... 14

III. AUTONOMY AND EXPENDITURE CONTROLS..... 18
The Nature of Expenditure Controls..... 18
Autonomy in the Historical Context..... 21
The Current Debate Over Expenditure Controls..... 23

IV. MISSIONS OF CONNECTICUT REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES..... 31

V. ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE MISSION..... 35
The Transfer Mission..... 35
Occupational and Vocational Mission..... 39
Community Service..... 44

VI. METHOD OF FUNDING..... 52
Disadvantages of Funding Based on Enrollment..... 53
Alternatives and Recommendations..... 58
Advantages of Funding Recommendations..... 59

VII. OPEN ENROLLMENT..... 61

VIII. FACULTY..... 66

IX. HEALTH SERVICES..... 69

X. DAY CARE..... 72

XI. FACILITIES..... 74

XII. INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES..... 76
Introduction..... 76

Asnuntuck Community College..... 76
Greater Hartford Community College..... 79
Housatonic Community College..... 81
Manchester Community College..... 84
Mattatuck Community College..... 86
Middlesex Community College..... 88
Mohegan Community College..... 91
Northwestern Connecticut Community College... 94
Norwalk Community College..... 96
Quinebaug Valley Community College..... 99
South Central Community College.....102
Tunxis Community College.....105

APPENDIX

Agency Response..... 1a

INTRODUCTION

Scope of Study and Review Procedure

Compliance Review

INTRODUCTION

The Program Review Committee is a bi-partisan statutory committee of the Connecticut General Assembly created in 1972 to study selected state programs and report to the members of the Assembly regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of the programs studied.

This fourth report of the Committee is concerned with the operation of the state regional community college system. This system is composed of a State Board of Trustees, a central office staff serving under the Board of Trustees' Executive Director, and twelve individual two-year colleges geographically distributed across the state.

The Committee selected the community college system for study because this system appears to present through its open enrollment program the best possible opportunity for Connecticut citizens to avail themselves of some form of post-secondary education, regardless of age, economic situation, or academic record.

The Committee is further concerned that the resources available to the community college system be properly managed, organized, and allocated so as to ensure that Connecticut citizens have as good an opportunity for post-secondary education as was intended by the Legislature when it created the state regional community college system in the mid-1960's.

Scope of Study and Review Procedure

This study was conducted over a six-month period and involved on-site visits to all twelve community colleges. In the course of these visits, all twelve college presidents were interviewed, as were all chief administrative officers at each of the institutions. On-site interviews also were conducted with faculty members and students at each institution. These interviews were conducted by both members of the Committee and the Committee's staff.

Additional interviews were conducted with members of the Community College Board of Trustees, the Board's Executive Director, members of the Executive Director's staff, the Chancellor for Higher Education, members of the Chancellor's staff, the Executive Director of the State Technical Colleges, the Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Finance and Control, and various other state officials whose offices are directly or indirectly related to the operation of the community college system.

The Committee also held a day-long public hearing on the operation of community colleges at which time over 300 pages of testimony were taken from both higher education officials and members of the general public.

A limited survey of employers of community college graduates was conducted. In addition, a review of the literature on community college operations in other states

was undertaken, and a detailed review of statutes, legislative hearings, legislative debates, state documents, departmental memorandums, letters, and other formal reports pertaining to the Connecticut community college system was conducted.

Compliance Review

It is standard Committee procedure to follow up initial reports on particular agencies with a compliance review. This compliance review usually occurs approximately twelve months after the issuance of the initial report.

This report on community colleges contains numerous recommendations for changes in administrative practices and suggests possible legislative action in a number of other areas. The Committee wishes to emphasize that this report is not "just another report." We expect remedial action to be taken where we have found deficiencies, and we intend to oversee future compliance with the recommendations contained in the report.

During the course of this study, the Committee and its staff enjoyed a remarkably cooperative relationship with the various personnel of the community colleges. The Board of Trustees, the Executive Director, and the administrators, faculty, and students of the community college system are complimented on the open and candid assistance they provided. This cooperation leads the Committee to believe that it will

enjoy continued cooperation in the implementation of the suggestions and recommendations contained in this report.

In the final analysis, the community college staff, the Legislature, and the citizens of this state have a common goal for community colleges. That goal is to produce the best community college operation possible in Connecticut. It is to the attainment of this goal that this report is directed.

Chapter I

HISTORY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Community Colleges in the United States

Community Colleges in Connecticut

Chapter I

HISTORY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Community Colleges in the United States

Although the state and public-supported college and university system was becoming well established by 1862, it was not until the United States Congress passed the Morrill Act in that year that a firm commitment to public higher education as a national value was evidenced.

The impact of the Morrill Act upon the system of higher education was monumental. In this Act are found the embodiment of the following basic education principles: low-cost college education for the common people, federal support of higher education, and a college curriculum which provides a nonsectarian, nonclassical education geared to the practical vocations and the applied sciences of engineering and technology in agriculture and industry.

It soon became clear that if more than 20 to 25 percent of the population was to benefit from post-secondary education, new frontiers must be explored. Many educators saw a two-year, public junior college serving as a feeder to the state college and university system as a viable solution for the increasing demand for higher education. In 1901, the first public junior college was established at *Joliet, Illinois.*

Originally, the community colleges served as a place where eligible students could enroll in two years of undergraduate study and served the transfer mission as well as providing terminal education. Gradually the community-based, public two-year college widened its scope to encompass the spectrum of community and cultural needs as well as those of a strictly educational nature. The three missions of the community college (college transfer, terminal, and community service) were articulated by educators as early as 1927.* These missions retain their essential validity today, although the terminal function presently is comprised of a high percentage of occupational as well as general education programs.

The national proliferation of community colleges increased at varying levels until the decade of the sixties, when these schools were located in forty-nine of the fifty states. The community college now has established itself firmly as a social, cultural, and educational institution in the country.

---

* David S. Bushnell, Organizing for Change; New Priorities for Community Colleges (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

Today there are over 1100 two-year community colleges in the United States with a combined enrollment approaching two-and-one-half million.* They represent the most rapidly growing segment of public education and comprise almost half of the post-secondary institutions in America.

The federal government has repeatedly demonstrated support for the community college system, yet the fact remains that support of these institutions remains primarily the burden of the individual state. In 1947, the Truman Commission on Higher Education** concluded that "the time has come to make education through the fourteenth grade available in the same way that high school is now available." The Eisenhower Committee on Education beyond the High School (1955-56)*** reiterated the same optimistic views on the role of the community college. Community colleges are today recognized as a legitimate part of higher education by the federal government and have been allocated funds by the National Defense Act of 1958, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Vocational Education Acts of 1963 and 1968, and the Higher Education Act of 1965.

---

* Saturday Review, February 9, 1974.

** Report of President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy (New York: Harper and Brothers, Vol. 1, 1947).

*** Report of President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, 1957.

Community Colleges in Connecticut

The state system of higher education in Connecticut was established by Public Act #330 of 1965. This Act mandated the development of a statewide network of community colleges. The state technical colleges remained under the direction of the State Board of Education. Twelve-man boards of trustees were established for the state university, the four-year colleges, and the embryo community college system. The Commission for Higher Education was established to provide overall coordination and direction for the system.

At the time of the passage of the Act, two community colleges were being operated by local municipalities (Norwalk and Manchester) and a third had been planned (Northwestern). A Study Commission on Higher Education had advanced the principle that there should be a community college to serve each major region of the state, and today twelve schools comprise the system.

The following is a synopsis of the evolution of the community college system as it presently exists:

Norwalk Community College - established by the city of Norwalk in 1961; transferred to the state system effective February 1, 1966.

Manchester Community College - established by the town of Manchester in 1963; transferred to state jurisdiction September 1, 1965.

Northwestern Connecticut Community College - planned by a local citizens committee in 1965 as a municipal institution; placed under state authority effective September 1, 1965.

Housatonic Community College - established as a branch of Norwalk Community College in 1966; established as a college in 1967 pursuant to Special Act #263 (1967).

Middlesex Community College - established as a branch of Manchester Community College in 1966; established as a college in 1967 pursuant to Special Act #262 (1967).

Greater Hartford Community College - established in 1967 pursuant to Special Act #308 (1967).

Mattatuck Community College - established in 1967 pursuant to Special Act #309 (1967).

South Central Community College - established in 1968 pursuant to Special Act #261 (1967).

Mohegan Community College - established in 1970 pursuant to Public Act #812, section 1 (1969).

Tunxis Community College - established in 1970 pursuant to Public Act #812, section 2 (1969).

Quinebaug Valley Community College - established in 1971 pursuant to Public Act #812, section 3 (1969).

Asnuntuck Community College - established in 1972 pursuant to Public Act #812, section 4 (1969).

Regarding quality standards of education, the first Administrative Report to the Governor by the Board of Trustees of Regional Community Colleges stated: "...that the community colleges, within the limits of their responsibility, should offer programs at least equal in quality

to those provided by the other state institutions of higher education."

The Report also stated the goal of establishing "a community college within reasonable commuting distance of every potential student in the state." This goal has apparently been fulfilled.

Enrollment in the Connecticut community colleges was over 23,000 in the fall of 1973. The system employs 1600 persons and has an operating budget of $17,965,000 for fiscal 1973-74.

Chapter II

GOVERNANCE OF THE STATE SYSTEM OF REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The First Level - Indirect Governance

The Second Level - The Commission for Higher Education

The Third Level - Line Agencies and Direct Administration

Chapter II

GOVERNANCE OF THE STATE SYSTEM OF REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Governance of the state system of regional community colleges exists at three basic levels. The first level consists of the legislative and executive branches of state government. Governance at this level is generally indirect. The laws enacted by the General Assembly and enforced by the Governor through the executive agencies find their direct application to the community colleges at other levels.

The second level of governance consists of the Commission for Higher Education. The basic role of the Commission is coordination among the various constituent sub-systems within the system of higher education in Connecticut.

Direct governance of the community college system is provided at the third level, which consists of the Board of Trustees for Community Colleges, the administrative personnel at each community college, and, in an advisory role, the Regional Councils appointed for each college by the Board of Trustees.

The First Level - Indirect Governance

The General Assembly

The Constitution of the State of Connecticut states that "[t]he legislative power of this state shall be vested

in two distinct houses or branches; the one to be styled the senate, the other the house of representatives, and both together the general assembly" (Article 3, Section 1). The laws on which the governance of the community college system is based are the product of the deliberation and decision-making processes of this body.

The Executive Department

"The supreme executive power of the state shall be vested in the governor" (Constitution of the State of Connecticut, Article 4, Section 5). If the Governor approves (signs) a bill transmitted to him by the General Assembly, it becomes law. He also may veto (disapprove) the bill, in which case it does not become law unless the veto is overridden by a two-thirds vote of each house of the General Assembly.

If the bill becomes law, it is the responsibility of the Governor, through his executive department, to enforce and administer it. It is mandated that the Governor "...shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed" (Constitution, Article 4, Section 12).

Note - The Judicial Department has various powers and responsibilities concerning the interpretation of laws and their legality or constitutionality, but these powers and responsibilities are not directly applicable here.

The Second Level - The Commission for Higher Education

The Commission for Higher Education consists of twelve members appointed by the Governor "...with the advice and consent of the general assembly" and one representative each from the Boards of Trustees for the University of Connecticut, the state colleges, the regional community colleges, and the state technical colleges. Of these sixteen members, at least one must "...be affiliated with a non public institution of higher education in the state" (Connecticut General Statute, 10-323).

The Commission for Higher Education is basically the planning and coordinating body. In addition to this responsibility, it conducts research in educational areas and makes recommendations to the General Assembly and Governor based on its findings. The Commission is "...responsible for licensing and accreditation of programs and institutions of higher learning" and publishes reports on matters appropriate to its responsibilities (C.G.S., 10-324[a]).

The Commission also is responsible for the preparation of a master plan for five-year operational periods. These master plans are prepared with the cooperation of the various sub-systems and are presented to the General Assembly and the Governor for approval. The master plan includes information on system goals, programs and program alteration, as well as methods for improving educational opportunities

in the state and for evaluating the success or failure of the system (C.G.S., 10-324[b]).

While the Commission for Higher Education is not directly concerned with the operational aspects of the community colleges in such areas as personnel and equipment purchases, it is involved in making budget recommendations and thus has an indirect role in some operational aspects.

The training of educational personnel and the development of programs for conducting such training are a part of the responsibility of the Commission. It also has certain coordinating, advisory, and supervisory functions dealing with expansion, purchase, or lease of facilities for higher education institutions.

In summary, the Commission for Higher Education acts as a coordinating, advisory, and supervisory unit for the sub-systems of the state system of higher education. Day-to-day administrative duties are performed at the line-level agencies: the Board of Trustees and the individual community college administrations.

The Third Level - Line Agencies and Direct Administration

The Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges

A twelve-member board of trustees is appointed by the Governor to administer the community colleges. The duties and responsibilities of the Board include conferring degrees

and certificates for the community colleges, employing faculty and staff, and selecting sites or leasing facilities for the schools.

The Board employs a professional staff which conducts research and other functions that the Board deems necessary. This central office supplies information to the Board to aid it in decision-making in such areas as the budget, capital projects, and programs and system development. The central office is also responsible for collecting appropriate information from the individual community colleges, reviewing this information, and presenting it to the Board.

The Board may appoint Regional Councils for the individual colleges. These Councils perform several functions in the area of a college's relationship with the community (region) it serves. A Council may supply information on regional needs, assist in developing programs to meet these needs, and assist in securing community participation. It also may help a college secure scholarship funds from private individuals, develop public information, and advise in the selection of sites and facilities.

The Board of Trustees is the major administrative unit for the colleges themselves. Budgets are formulated by the Board from requests submitted by the colleges. Enrollment projections, upon which a major portion of the budget is based, are also subject to Board approval.

The Board establishes general program and personnel guidelines as well as policies concerning promotions for college personnel. Requests for new programs, promotions, or additional personnel are formulated by the college administrators but are subject to approval by the Board.

The Board of Trustees may establish and maintain funds for the operation, maintenance, and repair of auxiliary service facilities (such as food service) and for establishing extension programs and summer school sessions (C.G.S., 10-38f and g).

Many administrative functions of the Board are subject to approval by the Commission for Higher Education. In actual practice, the roles of these two governing bodies sometimes overlap. It is reasonable to expect that the Commission, being responsible for the entire system of higher education, would require a supervisory role over sub-system governance. This role would be necessary in order to ensure the greatest coordination among the sub-systems in achieving the goals of the master plan.

College Administration

Administrators at the individual community colleges are generally responsible for the day-to-day operation of the colleges in accordance with guidelines from the other governing agencies. The community college presidents, deans, fiscal officers, or other administrators have some authority

to control the method of governance at the school (the establishment of administrative positions, the evaluation of faculty and programs, and the expenditure of allotted funds). However, their decisions are often subject to direct or indirect control by the Board of Trustees, the Commission for Higher Education, or other administrative agencies outside the educational realm, such as the Department of Finance and Control.

In essence, then, it is the general responsibility of college administrators to oversee internal functions such as registration, counseling, instruction, and student services; to prepare and submit budget, personnel, and program requests to the Board of Trustees; and to perform other functions within budget or management guidelines of the Board, Commission, or other agencies.

In reality, the authorities and responsibilities of the various governance units are much more complex than the statutory mandates discussed here. The problems of intervention, autonomy, and practical governance will be discussed in the next section.

Chapter III

AUTONOMY AND EXPENDITURE CONTROLS

The Nature of Expenditure Controls

Autonomy in the Historical Context

The Current Debate Over Expenditure Controls

Chapter III

AUTONOMY AND EXPENDITURE CONTROLS

The question of autonomy has given rise to the primary areas of contention in this study. The personnel and line agencies involved in the direct governance of the community college system and several other educational and accreditation bodies have presented a case for increasing and expanding the responsibilities and authorities of those personnel most directly involved in the governance of the system.

On the other hand, those agencies with the responsibility for controlling expenditures of state funds (most notably the Department of Finance and Control) have emphasized the necessity for what have been termed "pre-audit" controls.

Attempts to reach a compromise between these positions have been difficult, but the overwhelming importance of these functions to the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the community college system places the problem directly within the mandated responsibilities of the Program Review Committee.

The Nature of Expenditure Controls

In examining the nature of the functions of state agencies involved with controlling the expenditures of other

state agencies, it is first necessary to define those functions. The term "pre-audit," often used by the educational agencies involved in this controversy, does not provide an accurate description. "Audit" is defined as an examination, verification, or review, which is sufficient for describing one portion of the function - the examination of agency requests. However, the decision process (approval or disapproval of a request as a matter of policy) is not part of the audit function. This is, rather, a decisional control. The combination of these functions will be described as "expenditure controls."

There is general agreement that it is an appropriate function of the state government to control the expenditure of state funds. In Connecticut there are several levels at which such control is mandated.

The General Assembly controls the upper limit of expenditures by appropriating fixed amounts for defined purposes (line items). Requests for funds beyond the original appropriation (deficiency appropriations) also are controlled by the Legislature.

Prior to expenditure, appropriated funds are requisitioned in quarterly allotments from the Governor (C.G.S., 4-85). In addition to this control on overexpenditures, an agency may not "...incur any obligation, by order, contract or otherwise..." without the approval of the comptroller's

office which assures that "...the proposed commitment is within the applicable specific appropriation and the budgeted agency has unencumbered funds sufficient to defray such expenditure" (C.G.S., 4-98).

The Constitution of the State of Connecticut further mandates that "[t]he comptroller shall adjust [resolve, regulate] and settle all public accounts and demands..." (Article 4, Section 24), during which process the claims can be examined for propriety, legality, and accuracy. As a final check, the accounts of the treasurer, the comptroller, "...each officer, department, commission, board and court of the state government authorized to expend or contract for expenditure of any state appropriation, and of all institutions supported by the state..." are post-audited by the auditors of public accounts to ensure that no "...unauthorized, illegal, irregular or unsafe handling or expenditure of state funds..." is practiced or contemplated by any such agency (C.G.S., 4-63).

As can easily be seen, there are adequate mandated safeguards built into the system to control the amount, propriety, and timing of expenditures of appropriated funds. However, the nature of the expenditure controls at issue here goes beyond the realm of audit. It is the formulation of policy decisions regarding the way in which funds are expended that is the primary issue.

The educational agencies feel that they should be allowed to make decisions as to the way in which they expend their appropriations (within, of course, the fiscal controls described above). The control agencies state that their function provides for executive branch control over the types of expenditures that are made, a control they feel is appropriate because of their view of overall state expenditures and the ramifications of these expenditures for statewide planning.

There are valid arguments supporting both sides of this issue. However, it is first necessary to understand that this issue did not exist in the early historical context of the higher education system in Connecticut.

Autonomy in the Historical Context

When the state system of higher education was established by Public Act #330 of 1965, the constituent units of the system had the authority and responsibility for the expenditure of their appropriated funds. This situation existed until 1971, at which point a series of fiscal controls began to be implemented.

A letter to the Commissioner of Finance and Control (January 6, 1971) placed restrictions on filling state positions, promoting state employees, out-of-state travel, and the purchase of equipment and state automobiles. Executive

Order Number One (March 16, 1971) created a commission to study state government with an eye toward economy. Another Executive Order (Number Nine) further increased the restrictions to be enforced by the Commissioner of Finance and Control.

The General Assembly continued the trend toward austerity and expenditure control. Appropriations to agencies (especially those involved in welfare and higher education) were voted at austerity levels, and state employee salary increases were limited. The Appropriations Act (Special Act Number 1) of the June 1971 Special Session contained extensive sections describing the need for austerity measures and mandating expenditure controls (Sections 14-18). The higher education system was required to obtain the approval of the Finance Advisory Committee* in order to transfer funds between appropriations by Public Act 465 of that year (C.G.S., 10-328). At the time the state was running at deficit levels, and expenditures had been exceeding revenues. However, it is also true that the units of the higher education system had not been overexpending their appropriations, yet bore a heavy burden of the austerity measures and expenditure control. At present the regional

---

* The Finance Advisory Committee consists of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Treasurer, Comptroller, and five members of the General Assembly, and has a number of authorities and responsibilities (C.G.S., 4-93, 94, 95a).

community college system is still operating under many constraints despite its mandated authorities and responsibilities and a general improvement in the fiscal position of the state.

The Current Debate Over Expenditure Controls

Expenditure controls applied to the community college system have been the subject of much criticism, especially in recent years.

The Commission for Higher Education, in its Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut 1974-1979, made unequivocal statements concerning the pre-audit function. It remarked especially that "[c]hief administrative officers and boards of trustees, who are familiar with an institution and accountable for its success, can contribute greatly to the institution's cost effectiveness if they are allowed to make allocation and spending decisions" (p. 129). Resource Group VIII, in a discussion paper on finance prepared for the Commission, stated that "[t]he current policies of pre-audit controls of institutional spending by the Department of Finance and Control interfere with educational decisions and prevent the continuing improvement of management competence at the institutional level" (p. 64).

As a result of this information, the Commission has recommended "[t]hat the Governor and General Assembly provide

broad spending guidelines to the constituent units of public higher education, to be monitored and control[l]ed by the boards of trustees and the administrative officers of each unit, and that unnecessary pre-audit controls of day-to-day institutional decisions by the Department of Finance and Control be discontinued."*

The Education Commission of the States, in its Bulletin for April 1974, stated that "...within a state plan, individual schools, colleges, and universities should be held responsible for managing their operating funds, 'free of pre-audit by any state agency but subject to appropriate post-audits'"(p. 2).

The recommendation that "[t]he University of Connecticut should be provided general budget guidance by the Governor but otherwise should be accorded administrative flexibility in day-to-day operations, consistent with the satisfactory discharge of their responsibilities," made by the Federal Technical Assistance Program in a report entitled Strengthening Management and Budget Functions in the Connecticut State Government (p. 75) is directly applicable to the matter of pre-audit discussed here.

Concern about pre-audit and non-educational intervention is not limited to state governing bodies. The Commission

---

* Recommendation 117.

on Institutions of Higher Education (New England Association of Schools and Colleges), in a letter to the Director of the Board of Trustees concerning the accreditation of Mattatuck Community College, made this quite clear. M. Evans Monroe, Chairman of the Commission, stated two major concerns directly aimed at the pre-audit and intervention problem. The first was that "[t]he Commission is gravely concerned about the apparently unwarranted intrusion of non-educational state officers and agencies into matters normally and properly reserved to the individual educational institution or its board of trustees." Dr. Monroe also stated that "[t]he Commission is further concerned about the evident rigidity and inflexible nature of state fiscal and personnel policies and practices which inhibit the timely and orderly operation of institutions."

Research conducted by the Program Review Committee has supported a number of these contentions in specific areas. The Committee has found that:

1. There are various authorities and responsibilities mandated to the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges or the Commission for Higher Education which are, in reality, meaningless due to intervention from controlling agencies;
2. Educational decisions are being made by expenditure control personnel with little, if any, expertise

in the educational field and/or little knowledge of situations at the individual schools;

3. Expenditure controls are not applied with consistency;
4. Expenditure controls create time lags and reduce flexibility in planning and operation;
5. Expenditure controls as currently practiced can easily be arbitrary or political in nature; and
6. Expenditure controls as currently practiced are not truly economical or efficient.

Despite these significant weaknesses, there are compelling reasons for the presence of some sort of expenditure control system. In examining the current system, the Program Review Committee found that:

1. The controlling agencies often have a broader view of the state's economic situation and planning efforts, and are better able to make expenditure decisions in the light of this broader view;
2. Expenditure controls are a further check on agency overexpenditures, thus lessening the likelihood of deficiency appropriations which may exceed revenues; and
3. Expenditure controls make it easier for the executive branch to monitor spending, especially during periods of economic change or uncertainty.

It is obvious that there are valid criticisms of the expenditure control system as it currently exists, but it is equally obvious that the current system provides certain advantages. The Program Review Committee believes that the major breakdowns, inconsistencies, and inaccuracies that occur in the system are the result of three basic factors: a lack of meaningful communication and cooperation between requesting agencies and control agencies; a lack of standard procedures and criteria for decision making; and a lack of clearly mandated authorities and responsibilities for the agencies involved.

The control agencies have been granted widespread powers and authorities on the basis of the general powers mandated to the executive branch of state government and by Executive Orders and other communications from the office of the Governor. These widespread powers, which are not clearly mandated by the General Statutes, make it all too easy for control agencies to assume a position of superiority over the requesting agencies. The opportunities for arbitrary and even malicious behavior on the part of control officials abound in such an undefined yet powerful system.

The current system elicits the opposite reaction from officials in requesting agencies. If they view their decision-making powers as meaningless in the face of the overwhelming power of the control agencies to contradict them, it is not unreasonable to expect them to react by <u>not</u>

making these decisions and by passing all requests on to the control agencies, resigning themselves to whatever result occurs there.

The damage that can be done by both of these situations is obvious. Decisions are made on the basis of only a part of the available information, and planning is a meaningless exercise because the planners (community college administrators and the Board of Trustees) cannot be sure that their plans will be implemented, even if they are initially accepted by the Legislature and the Governor.

Evaluation of the activities of the community colleges is difficult because there is no defined line of accountability. If the community colleges are failing to fulfill their missions, is it the fault of the college administrators, the Board of Trustees, or the Department of Finance and Control? If they are succeeding, who should get the credit? These questions cannot be answered because planning, decision making, and responsibility are diffused among many agencies.

While the Program Review Committee fully realizes that making meaningful improvements in the expenditure control system will be complex and difficult, and that any such changes will have broad application to other state agencies, there are several areas in which change is necessary. It should be emphasized that many of the other problems described in this report are at least partially caused by the inability of a direct governing body to act on them in a meaningful

way and to be held responsible for its actions. The solution of this problem will be the major step in ensuring that the community college operation is efficient, effective, and economical.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD PASS LEGISLATION THAT CLEARLY DEFINES THE AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR ACTIVITIES UNDER THIS LEGISLATION.

2. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD CLEARLY DEFINE THE AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS AND HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE FOR THESE ACTIVITIES.

3. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD PASS LEGISLATION CLEARLY DEFINING THE AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONTROL AGENCIES.

4. IN KEEPING WITH THE AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES MANDATED, THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND CONTROL SHOULD ISSUE CLEAR AND CONCISE STANDARD REGULATIONS TO ALL STATE AGENCIES, INDICATING THE WAY IN WHICH ALL REQUESTS ARE PROCESSED AND THE CRITERIA NECESSARY FOR COMPLETED REQUESTS.

4A. THESE REGULATIONS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO THE LEGISLATIVE REGULATIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE FOR APPROVAL IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS MEET THE STANDARDS NECESSARY FOR EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND ECONOMICAL GOVERNANCE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM.

5. IN THE EVENT THAT A DECISION MADE BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES WILL HAVE AN IMPACT ON AN INTER-REGIONAL OR STATEWIDE BASIS, THE BOARD SHOULD BE NOTIFIED TO THAT EFFECT BY THE APPROPRIATE CONTROL AGENCY.

5A. SUCH NOTIFICATION SHOULD INCLUDE A COMPLETE DISCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS AS

SEEN BY THE CONTROL AGENCY AND/OR OTHER APPROPRIATE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES AND CITIZEN GROUPS.

6. OPERATIONS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM AND THE CONTROL AGENCIES SHOULD BE CONDUCTED WITH MAXIMUM POSSIBLE COMMUNICATION AND COOPERATION AMONG THEM.

7. ANY CONTROL AGENCY DISAPPROVAL SHALL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A COMPLETE EXPLANATION OF THE REASONS FOR THE DISAPPROVAL.

Chapter IV

MISSIONS OF CONNECTICUT REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Chapter IV

MISSIONS OF CONNECTICUT REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

According to the Connecticut General Statutes (Section 10-326[3] and Public Act 73-281) regional community colleges in this state have three major responsibilities or missions: providing college transfer programs, providing occupational training, and providing "extension" or community service programs.

Although the statutes give no indication of which mission the Legislature felt was most important, it is clear that the current emphasis in the community colleges is on liberal arts/transfer programs. A significant percentage of the colleges' instructional budgets is spent on liberal arts programs, and in most colleges, a preponderence of students are enrolled in a liberal arts/transfer program.

There appear to be two main reasons for the concentration on liberal arts/transfer programs. First, the community college system has not been in existence long enough to establish an identity of its own; thus it is often wrongly assumed that these colleges are merely carbon copies of the first two years of four-year colleges. Transfer programs would, of course, receive the greatest emphasis under this very traditional view of the community college's mission.

A second reason for the apparent overemphasis on liberal arts/transfer programs is that they are comparatively inexpensive to operate. Occupational programs, on the other hand, often require the use of costly equipment and small, lab-style classes, which increase the cost of offering these courses.

The Program Review Committee is concerned about the apparent imbalance in carrying out the various missions prescribed in the statutes. The Committee believes that each mission is vitally important and that each must be carried out to the fullest extent possible.

Liberal arts/transfer programs provide a low-cost, close-to-home opportunity for students to obtain an associate's degree or to complete the first two years of a four-year college program. In addition, a number of students enroll in these programs to determine if they are prepared for college-level work, or to take one or two courses in an area in which they are interested. For many students, enrolling in the liberal arts/transfer program at the community college is the only way they can afford to attend college.

Occupational programs are becoming both increasingly popular and increasingly vital in our technological society. Many people, realizing that a highly skilled worker seldom has difficulty finding work, are taking advantage

of occupational programs to learn these skills. Although the ratio of liberal arts to occupational students is about 60 percent to 40 percent in the average community college today, many college administrators feel that this situation is changing and that occupational enrollment will probably increase.

Community service programs are what differentiate community colleges from junior colleges. A number of community colleges have established innovative community service programs in such areas as human relations for factory supervisory personnel, workshops on federal safety requirements for businessmen, and extension programs for servicemen stationed in nearby towns. Other colleges have emphasized the more traditional community service "leisure-time" courses, such as ceramics and photography courses. A clearer delineation of the colleges' community service mission in the statutes, and some guidance from the central office and the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges, would result in a more comprehensive community service program for the colleges.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

8. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD REPEAL SECTION 10-326(3) OF THE GENERAL STATUTES AND SUBSTITUTE CLEAR, CONCISE, AND MEANINGFUL DEFINITIONS OF THE MISSIONS OF THE REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM.

9. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD PROVIDE CLEAR AND MEANINGFUL GUIDELINES FOR THE COLLEGES TO HELP THEM DETERMINE THEIR ROLE IN THE STATE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM, ESPECIALLY IN REGARD TO ASSIGNING PRIORITY AMONG THE COLLEGES' MISSIONS AND DETERMINING WHAT PROGRAMS ARE APPROPRIATE FOR CARRYING OUT THE VARIOUS MISSIONS.

Chapter V

ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE MISSION

The Transfer Mission

Occupational and Vocational Mission

Community Service

Chapter V

ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE MISSION

One of the major questions to be answered in this study is how well the community colleges have accomplished their three legislatively mandated missions.

It is noted earlier that there is some vagueness in the statutes regarding the three missions of the colleges and that there is some legislative overlap with other components of the Connecticut higher education system regarding responsibility for the accomplishment of these missions. For our purposes we will attempt to deal with each of the missions separately and in that order in which the Committee finds each mission being best fulfilled.

The Transfer Mission

As previously noted, community colleges have primary statutory responsibility for providing two-year transfer associate degree programs in Connecticut. The Committee found that, throughout the system, there was a major emphasis on providing liberal arts and so-called "general" type courses, which obviously have their greatest utility for students transferring to four-year institutions.

On face value, the Committee must conclude that community colleges are fulfilling the legislative mandate to provide transfer programs.

The Committee found throughout the system that a major portion of each school's program is devoted to transfer and general education. But because of the high attrition among enrollees in this program and the lack of uniform data on the performance of graduates in transfer programs, it was difficult to properly assess the relative worth of what is being accomplished by the system's efforts in providing this abundance of liberal arts curricula.

The student personnel officers of most of the individual institutions do attempt to collect data on the academic success of students who have transferred to four-year colleges in the state. But the information collected is incomplete.

The Committee has concluded that while the available information regarding the success rate of transfers from community colleges is insufficient, the information does seem to imply that those students who transfer from community colleges to state four-year colleges do, on the average, as well academically as do those students who have attended the four-year institutions from the start of their freshman year.

The central office of the community college system presently does not have a formal information-sharing arrangement with the four state colleges and the state university regarding the success of community college

transfers at those colleges.

It was suggested to the Committee that such information sharing would be a violation of student privacy. However, this problem could be solved through the use of simple safeguard procedures.

The Committee cannot emphasize too strongly its concern that educators establish good procedures for evaluating the quality of the end product of their programs. It is most important to know how well these students achieve after they have entered the four-year schools.

The Program Review Committee also found that there is no statewide system for coordination of transfer requirements and course structure and content among the constituent units of higher education in Connecticut. All too often, a student transferring from a community college to one of the four-year state colleges or the University of Connecticut finds that he will not receive full credit for the work he has completed.

One of the major reasons for this loss of credit is the fact that in some cases course descriptions and/or requirements differ between the two-year and four-year systems. In the past, these problems sometimes have been solved by personal contacts between teachers or counselors at the schools involved, but this method is haphazard and

inconsistent as it relies on the presence and activity of specific people within the system.

RECOMMENDATION:

10. THE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION SHOULD INSTITUTE A UNIFORM TRANSFER SYSTEM FOR THE CONTITUENT UNITS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATE. THIS SYSTEM SHOULD MANDATE TRANSFER REQUIREMENTS AND DEFINE THE GENERAL STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF COURSES TO THE SATISFACTION OF ALL CONSTITUENT SUBSYSTEMS OF THE STATE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM.

The Committee also is concerned with the strong emphasis by the community colleges in the area of general transfer curricula. It is noted, however, that the system is in the midst of a concerted effort to increase the emphasis on vocational and occupationally oriented programs. This change in emphasis has been necessitated by the recent discovery on the part of students that bachelor's degrees in liberal arts do not necessarily ensure a secure and prosperous future.

The majority of the students interviewed during this study did indicate an eventual desire to obtain a four-year degree. But they also expressed a deep desire for obtaining an education that would provide them with an employable skill. This brings us to the second mission of the community colleges, which is to provide terminal occupational programs.

Occupational and Vocational Mission

Although the Committee found that community college efforts in establishing terminal occupational programs are gaining strength, it also found that these programs are limited, and, although they constitute a major portion of the curriculum, they are overshadowed by the general education and transfer programs. The majority of the faculty presnetly employed by the community colleges are directly involved in liberal arts programs, and, of course, the majority of students are enrolled in programs other than those directly leading to the attainment of salable vocational skills.

Many of the administrators in the community college system expressed a concern that they were either unable or not allowed to develop needed occupational programs.

However, the Committee did find that those efforts being made in occupational education appear to be of high quality despite poor equipment, limited usable space, and little central planning and coordination. The Committee found very little evidence of research concerning local community occupational needs that would assist in the management of vocational programs at the community colleges.

We did find that employers are, for the most part, pleased with the performance of vocational graduates of the community colleges. Employers who have hired graduates

or who have sent employees to the community colleges for further training expressed satisfaction with their performance.

The community colleges represent, in some cases, the only higher education option for many employers to draw on, both for graduates and the continuing education of persons already employed. This is especially true in rural areas of the state.

Because of this service to employers and of the increasing need for skilled technical, manufacturing, and service personnel in the state, the emphasis on technical and career education programs should be increased.

It was indicated that the community colleges are generally not allowed by the Commission for Higher Education to duplicate technical programs offered at the state technical colleges. The Committee also was told by the Executive Director of the State Technical Colleges that cooperation between the technical colleges and the community colleges, with some exceptions, has been poor. It even has been suggested that in the past the technical colleges have had a policy of <u>not</u> cooperating with the community college system in providing occupational and vocational education for the state.

The Committee found this non-cooperation to be caused in part by professional jealousy between the personnel in

the two systems. The faculty members of the four two-year state technical colleges are apparently fearful that they might suffer a reduction in status if they become too closely identified with the operations of the community colleges.

The Committee finds that such jealousy is not in the best interests of education.

It has been proposed that the two-year technical college system and the two-year community college system be combined so that a concerted, coordinated statewide effort in post-secondary occupational and technical education might be launched. It would be far better to have 16 technical community colleges or some reduced, combined number than to continue with the inefficient, double system we presently have.

The Committee found that the original Commission for Higher Education Master Plan recommended the combining of the two college systems under one board of trustees. But because of many difficulties, this plan was abandoned and no such recommendation was made in the final Master Plan.

The Executive Director of the State Technical Colleges has stated that the eventual combination of the two systems and the creation of a system of technical community colleges would be logical and desirable.

The Program Review Committee finds the logic of such a merger to be inescapable. Administrative duplication would be reduced while coordination and cooperation would be increased. The statutes defining the missions of the two college systems are practically the same. Thus, it seems illogical and wasteful to have two separate governmental agencies charged with similar missions.

During the past legislative session, the General Assembly authorized the establishment of a new board of trustees for the state technical colleges separate from the State Board of Education, which formerly had this jurisdication.

Both the Commissioner for Higher Education and the Executive Director of the State Technical Colleges supported the legislation creating a separate board of trustees. They state that this separate board was created as a first step toward combining the two systems.

The Committee recommends that the General Assembly combine the state technical college board and the community college board during its next session.

Graduate Follow-up and Placement

The Committee has found that the community colleges must improve their ability to collect information regarding the placement and success of graduates. There is little or no effort being made by the community colleges to compile

usable data on vocational graduates regarding their placement and performance after graduation.

Better data on graduate success could be obtained if a greater emphasis were placed on the placement efforts at each of the twelve institutions. At present, most administrators charged with conducting placement admit that they do little in the way of trying to place graduates or collect information from employers concerning these graduates. The major placement effort presently being conducted is in the area of locating and placing presently enrolled students in part-time employment as part of the students' financial aid.

In order for proper evaluation of occupational programs to take place, adequate placement of graduates and placement data collection on these graduates must be instituted at all twelve community colleges and coordinated by the Board of Trustees.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

11. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHOULD ENSURE THAT THE NECESSARY FOLLOW-UP AND OTHER APPROPRIATE INFORMATION ON TRANSFER, OCCUPATION, AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS BE AVAILABLE FOR DECISION MAKING.

12. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD PASS LEGISLATION COMBINING THE BOARDS OF TRUSTEES FOR REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND FOR STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGES.

Community Service

Community service has been mandated by the General Assembly as one of the three specific missions of the Connecticut community college system. Community service is the most recent area of community college activity and is still the least developed and the most poorly financed.

One meaningful definition of community service is "[e]ducational, cultural, and recreational services which an educational institution may provide for its community in addition to its regularly scheduled day and evening classes."* The diversity among the communities in size, type, and location produce a diversity of community service programs. A recent national survey indicated that the following activities are typical: adult evening education programs and extension centers; non-credit courses; conferences and workshops to meet the needs of local citizens; cultural programs; recreation; and programs concerned with the solution of local social, political, and economic problems.

The Public Act which mandates community service as one of the three missions of the Connecticut community college system (P.A. 73-281) is unclear as to the type of activities to be undertaken as well as the emphasis to be given to community service relative to the other two missions.

---

* Quoted in, Charles R. Monroe, Profile of the Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972), p. 129.

The Program Review Committee found the following problem areas in its examination of the administration of community services by the Board of Trustees and its central office:

1. The Board of Trustees and the central office provide virtually no coordination among the colleges in the category of community service.
2. The Board of Trustees and the central office issue no guidelines for program selection or allocation of resources for this mission.
3. The central office has established no information system for community service and does not monitor this program in a meaningful manner. Information is not available on programs by type, number of community members served, or cost of community services.

Public Act 73-281 calls for a system of college and university community service programs designed to "assist in the identification and solution of community problems." Thus, this legislation apparently zeroes in on community problems as the focal point toward which community service programs should be directed. The Program Review Committee suggests that legislation be drawn that more clearly describes the types of community service to be mandated. For this purpose, community service programs might be broadly classified as: (1) educational, (2) cultural, (3) recreational,

and (4) community-directed.

In addition to a lack of clarity regarding the type of program to be conducted, the legislation does not discuss the emphasis to be given to community service relative to the other two missions (college transfer and occupational education). This has resulted in this mission being comparatively under-emphasized.

Funding of the community college system is discussed subsequently in this report. It should be noted at this point, however, that the basis for funding is essentially a head count, and the heads that are counted are to be found in either the college transfer program or the occupational program. Although the General Assembly has mandated three specific missions for the community college system, state funding is based on only two, and there is no minimum level of effort specified for the third mission, community service. It came as little surprise to the Program Review Committee to find several colleges in which the community service program was definitely a low priority. The central office states that it spends approximately half (47 percent) of its personnel budget of $327,375 in the categories of research, program development and planning, coordination among the colleges, and designing and implementing guidelines, but these activities are only in evidence as a token effort in the area of community service.

The central office states that "[c]ommunity services is by definition a program oriented to the needs of a college locale. Therefore, it would be inappropriate for the Central Office to control general community service programs at the colleges."

The Program Review Committee agrees that community service should certainly be conducted on a locally autonomous basis, and the Committee certainly does not suggest central office "control." However, it is obvious that the community service effort, one of the basic missions of the community college system, should have direction and guidance as well as coordination from the Board of Trustees and the central office if this effort is to have any real impact.

The need for a coordinated approach is vitally urgent, not only in the areas of program development and evaluation, but more specifically in the realm of allocation of available resources on the part of the colleges. For example, the central office reports that only four of the twelve colleges have a full-time director of community service. The Board of Trustees apparently has no policy as to the advisability of having such a position. The presence of a full-time community service director apparently bears no relationship to the amount of funds which the colleges expend in the area of community service.

The General Assembly has mandated that the Commission for Higher Education provide for a comprehensive and coordinated statewide system of community service. The Program Review Committee has found little evidence that the Commission is fulfilling this coordination function.

Perhaps the greatest shortcoming on the part of the central office regarding community service is the almost complete lack of any information system for this mission. Efforts in this direction have been essentially limited to an annual compilation of descriptions of programs provided by the colleges. No meaningful information was available from the central office on expenditures by college for the community service mission. And the figures that were provided were useless because there was no unified method of reporting, making it impossible for the central office to estimate state monies expended. These amounts clearly reflect the lack of systematic spending policy for community service (Table I).

Column one represents the central office response to a Program Review Committee request for the amount of money spent by each college for community services.

Column two represents the flat grants awarded to each college by the central office and Board of Trustees prior to FTE allocations to each school.

Column three represents the percentage of each college's budget which was reported as being spent on community service. Only two of the schools reported spending in this mission at a higher percentage than one-tenth of one percent of total budget.

All three sets of figures were provided by the central office. These figures demonstrate not only a lack of central policy for community service fiscal effort, but an inability to even define the level of expenditure.

Table I

Community Services

College	Fall 1973 Total Enrollment	(1) 1972-73 Total Expenditures	(2) 1972-73 Central Ofc. Grant	(3) Reported % of Total Budget
Manchester	4070	$ 99,693	$2,000	1.0%
Housatonic	2742	42,400	2,000	-
Norwalk	2656	8,000	2,000	0.1
Mattatuck	2530	27,680	2,000	-
Tunxis	2309	52,790*	2,000	-
Middlesex	1864	7,960	2,000	0.1
Northwestern	1757	14,485	2,000	0.1
Greater Hartford	1424	11,250	2,000	0.1
South Central	1397	118,500	2,000	-
Mohegan	1186	29,100	2,000	0.1
Asnuntuck	775	6,640**	-	0.1
Quinebaug Valley	485	12,160	1,500	5.9

* Data available for spring term only.
** Spring only, new college in fall.

In response to the Committee's request regarding estimated annual expenditures for committee service the central office stated "This is difficult to estimate since colleges spend money out of a variety of accounts for community services, and similar programs conducted on different campuses have different funding sources. Therefore, this is an attempt to estimate funding on a consistent basis, which may not accurately reflect monies spent on a particular campus. It also includes funding from all sources, not just state appropriations. It does not include any funds for the college's full or part-time community service director, nor any college overhead expenditures." Thus, the central office is unable to provide even an estimate of the state monies expended for this mission.

It must be noted here that the expenditures listed in Table I above probably include tuition payments by individuals attending "extension" courses. This does not mean that such programs are completely self-sustaining, as administrative and facilities costs must be included. Extension courses are only one aspect of community service.

Community service functions are obviously expending state funds. It is the position of the Program Review Committee that figures should be available to the General Assembly as to how much money is involved as well as to the impact of the various programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

13. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD PASS LEGISLATION CLEARLY DEFINING THE COMMUNITY SERVICE MISSION OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

14. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHOULD ISSUE SUCH GUIDELINES AND REGULATIONS CONCERNING COMMUNITY SERVICES AS ARE NECESSARY TO ENSURE THAT THIS MISSION IS FULFILLED.

15. THE INDIVIDUAL COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSESSING COMMUNITY NEEDS AND DESIGNING PROGRAMS TO MEET THESE NEEDS.

15A. THESE DECISIONS SHOULD BE MADE WITH THE INPUT OF ALL APPROPRIATE ADVISORY GROUPS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS.

Chapter VI

METHOD OF FUNDING

Disadvantages of Funding Based on Enrollment

Alternatives and Recommendations

Advantages of Funding Recommendations

Chapter VI

METHOD OF FUNDING

The funding for the community colleges is based on enrollment rather than awarded on a fixed-grant basis. Because of the high proportion of part-time students in the system (53 percent for fall, 1973), enrollment for funding purposes is expressed in terms of student contact hours (SCH). A student taking two courses that meet for three hours weekly would represent six student contact hours.

Enrollment is also expressed by the central office in terms of full-time equivalent students (FTE). These two methods of expressing enrollment are very closely related. Those states across the nation using enrollment as a basis for funding generally utilize the FTE method. SCH is used in Connecticut for basic funding purposes to allow for courses that do not run a full fifteen weeks, or that have more contact hours than the average three-credit course (such as laboratory courses).

The monies provided to the Board of Trustees for Community Colleges designate only vaguely how the funds are to be spent. For example, in fiscal 1974-75, 98 percent of the total community college funding of $21,085,000 is designated for:

(1)	Personnel Services	$15,618,000
(2)	Other Expenses	4,567,000
(3)	Equipment	556,000

The central office, acting as the operational unit of the Board of Trustees, is responsible for allocating funds among the twelve colleges. Prior to this allocation, funds are set aside for the following expenses:

(1) Operation of the central office (approximately $330,000 for fiscal 1973-74)

(2) Lease costs

(3) Plant expenses

(4) Community service programs

(5) New occupational programs

(6) Contracts with hospitals for health occupational programs

Fiscal allotments are then awarded to each of the twelve community colleges based on their projected enrollment figures for the coming year. Enrollment is computed on a full-time equivalent (FTE) basis.

Disadvantages of Funding Based on Enrollment

Because the General Assembly does not earmark funding to be used for specific purposes, such as community service or libraries, the Board of Trustees is free, in many cases, to allocate money at its discretion, with minimal accountability to the Legislature.

Often, the Board of Trustees provides little or no guidance as to the proportion of resources to be devoted to a specific program area. The individual colleges are free to allocate funds as they see fit.

This results in a wide divergence of funding levels for programs among the colleges; thus, although each student in the system theoretically receives equal financial support from the state, the services vary greatly in type and level depending on which college a student attends.

The large variance among the schools in funding community service programs is documented elsewhere in this report, as are the figures for providing student health services.

The following tables illustrate examples of disparities in programmatic spending that the Program Review Committee views as meaningful. The figures used were provided by the central office of the Board of Trustees.

The fact that funding is based primarily on enrollment means many programs that must be regarded as fixed-cost programs (i.e., not directly tied to enrollment) suffer in many of the colleges.

An example of a fixed-cost expenditure would be the ommunity service program or the library operation (Table II).

Table II

Library *

College	Total Enrollment**	1972-73 Expenditures
Manchester	4070	$66,511
Housatonic	2742	75,328
Norwalk	2656	98,897
Mattatuck	2530	85,597
Tunxis	2309	49,088
Middlesex	1864	39,318
Northwestern	1757	51,691
Greater Hartford	1424	67,264
South Central	1397	32,521
Mohegan	1186	48,125
Asnuntuck	775	14,742
Quinebaug Valley	485	14,937

* Includes personnel services and "other expenditures"

** Fall, 1973, figures for "general fund enrollment" are used because they are the latest available. These figures may vary slightly from 1972-73 enrollment.

Other non-instructional programs are only partially related to enrollment. Support for guidance and remedial programs varies widely among the colleges (Tables III and IV).

Table III

Counseling (Guidance)

College	Fall 1973 Total Enrollment	1973-74 FTE Counselors
Manchester	4070	5 1/2
Housatonic	2742	3 1/4
Norwalk	2656	5 1/4
Mattatuck	2530	5 1/2
Tunxis	2309	2 1/2
Middlesex	1864	3
Northwestern	1757	2 1/4
[illegible]eater Hartford	1424	4
[illegible]h Central	1397	3
Mohegan	1186	2
Asnuntuck	775	1
Quinebaug Valley	485	1

Table IV

Remedial Programs

College	Total Enrollment	Full-Time Personnel
Manchester	4070	3
Housatonic	2742	4
Norwalk	2656	1
Mattatuck	2530	3
Tunxis	2309	3
Middlesex	1864	5
Northwestern	1757	0
Greater Hartford	1424	2
South Central	1397	2
Mohegan	1186	3
Asnuntuck	775	0
Quinebaug Valley	485	1

The central office also reports the following patterns of part-time personnel in remedial programs, although hours per week of availability are not indicated:

Housatonic, 1; Manchester, 1; Mattatuck, fall-2, spring-0; Mohegan, 1; Northwestern, English 1/2, math 1 1/4; Quinebaug Valley, 1; South Central, 1; Tunxis, 2-3.

Funding on an enrollment basis does not take into account that occupational education is generally more expensive than other post-secondary studies. This is due to equipment cost and small class size and is particularly evident in the health professions.

Commission for Higher Education figures show an FTE funding level of $1,153 per student for the community colleges (1973-74), while the technical colleges, which are essentially occupationally oriented, were funded at a rate of $2,049 per student. The latter group has increased FTE funding by 114 percent since 1967-68, while the community college increase over the same period was only 47 percent.

Equal funding for occupational and non-occupational programs has resulted in transfer and general education courses often being conducted in highly crowded conditions while funds are allocated to keep occupational programs afloat.

Although class size, as well as cost of instructional equipment, often varies widely among courses, each contact hour receives the same dollar amount.

Alternatives and Recommendations

A study of state funding patterns across the country shows a wide variety of formulae. Enrollment (FTE) continues to be an important factor in the financing of community colleges; however, many states are now combining funding for ongoing college expenses with enrollment funding.

Also, some states have begun to use different funding levels for occupational programs to account for the more expensive nature of this type of education.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

16. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD ALTER THE METHOD OF FUNDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO PROVIDE FOR DESIGNATED APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FOLLOWING EIGHT BROAD CATEGORIES:

    1. LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS
    2. PLANT MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS
    3. STUDENT SERVICES
    4. ADMINISTRATION AND GENERAL EXPENSES
    5. COMMUNITY SERVICES
    6. GUIDANCE
    7. REMEDIATION
    8. INSTRUCTION

16A. ENROLLMENT FIGURES SHOULD BE USED ONLY AS A BASIS FOR FUNDING INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS.

16B. OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS SHOULD BE FUNDED AT A HIGHER LEVEL THAN COLLEGE TRANSFER AND GENERAL PROGRAMS. THESE LEVELS SHOULD

REALISTICALLY REFLECT COST DIFFERENTIALS, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT SUCH FACTORS AS CLASS SIZE AND EQUIPMENT COSTS.

16C. A THIRD LEVEL OF FUNDING COULD BE UTILIZED FOR SUPPORTING HEALTH SERVICES OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS IF NECESSARY.

This recommendation enables the General Assembly to earmark appropriations for the eight broad areas above, and this type of budgeting is geared toward a balanced spending of whatever funds are appropriated.

In addition, present funding methods do not account for the fact that occupational education is generally more expensive than other post-secondary education, transfer, and general programs.

Advantages of Funding Recommendations

These recommended funding methods have a number of advantages over a system in which allocations are made only on an enrollment basis.

Accountability to the Legislature is assured because all allocated funds are earmarked for broadly defined, yet specific program areas. The General Assembly can thus have knowledge and control of the balanced level of support for these program areas. Colleges will no longer be able to spend money on certain programs at the expense of others, and the General Assembly will have some assurance that appropriations are providing similar levels

of service at each college.

By recognizing the reality that occupational education is more costly than college transfer or general education, occupational programs will no longer have to be perpetuated at the expense of other programs. This proposed method of funding would remove inequities which presently exist in such areas as guidance, community service, remedial programs, libraries, and student services.

It is important to note here that these recommendations provide only a change in funding method, not necessarily an increase in the amount of total funding. Although certain colleges might be required to shift their spending priorities, such a shift would not present a prima facie case for increased funding.

Chapter VII

OPEN ENROLLMENT

Chapter VII

OPEN ENROLLMENT

The policy of open enrollment is almost universally accepted across the country. This system, which opens public education at the thirteenth and fourteenth grade levels to any citizen who has successfully completed the first twelve, has opened doors to opportunity for an untold number of people, both young and not so young in this country and in this state.

Identifiable problems are beginning to emerge, and it is the opinion of the Program Review Committee that these problems must be recognized and dealt with if open enrollment is to continue in a meaningful manner in Connecticut.

In pursuing the policy of open enrollment, the community college system faces several difficulties which are not encountered in more traditional institutions of higher learning. The background of the non-traditional student generally calls for intensive counseling upon entrance into college, and frequently requires remedial work (particularly in reading).

Inadequacies in these functions are at least partially due to the failure of the central office of the Board of Trustees to:

1. Establish a working information system to gather

data from the colleges concerning reading abilities, attrition, guidance, etc.;

2. Evaluate the need for, and effectiveness of, ongoing guidance and remedial programs;
3. Establish criteria and guidelines for uniform testing procedures and minimum guidance and remedial services; and
4. Conduct meaningful research both within the Connecticut system and on a nationwide basis to establish guidance and remedial program needs, alternatives, and related costs.

The guidance function, universally regarded as a vital aspect of open-enrollment education, is inadequate in most of the colleges. The schools vary widely in the number of full-time equivalent counselors they employ (Table III), and the central office has not issued guidelines or direction regarding the guidance function.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

17. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHOULD ESTABLISH AND MANDATE CRITERIA FOR THE MINIMUM LEVEL OF COUNSELING NEEDED AT EACH INSTITUTION. THESE CRITERIA SHOULD BE BASED ON THE COLLECTION OF MEANINGFUL INFORMATION FROM THE COLLEGES, PROGRAM EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH AND INFORMATION FROM OTHER STATES AND APPROPRIATE SOURCES.

Open enrollment also presents the problem of providing quality remedial reading programs at the community colleges.

A surprising number of entering students, all of whom have received a high school diploma, cannot read well enough to succeed at the college level.

The central office has not issued guidelines or standards regarding reading levels, but several of the reading specialists in the system regard the tenth grade, fifth month level as a minimum for successful completion of a community college course. These reading instructors estimate that perhaps 40 to 50 percent of entering high school graduates have not attained that reading level, and estimates of students who cannot read at the 8th grade level range as high as 20 to 24 percent.

Exact figures are not available, as the Board of Trustees has not mandated that entering freshmen be tested for reading ability. Also, the Board has not mandated that students who are grossly deficient in reading skills be required to attend remedial courses.

An independent reading specialist consulted by the Program Review Committee suggests a direct correlation between low reading level and the traditionally high attrition rate in community colleges. "To sit with a book which one can't read comprehensibly creates a very high level of frustration. Hostility becomes directed toward the educational institution and it doesn't take long for a student to 'drop out' in such a situation."

One Connecticut community college reading specialist comments, "What started as the open door has become, in large part, the revolving door."

When the high school diploma was originally adopted as the basic criterion for open-enrollment admission to community colleges, it was generally assumed that a high school graduate could read at least at the eighth grade level.

This has not proven to be the case. "Social promotions" have resulted in an overwhelming number of diplomas being awarded to graduates unable to read at the eighth grade level. It is also reasonable to assume that an employer who traditionally considered a high school diploma meaningful is now placed in a confusing situation.

The Program Review Committee believes that it is necessary to supplement the high school diploma with basic information formerly assumed to be implicit in the high school degree by institutions of higher learning and potential employers.

In today's society it is important to have a high school diploma, but it is <u>crucial</u> to know how to read. The high school should bear the responsibility of teaching the student to read at the eighth grade level, and the community college should assist the student in achieving whatever level is ultimately regarded as appropriate for

successful completion of a college program.

An interesting facet of the reading problem is the fact that in many cases a person applying for a high school equivalency certificate in the State of Connecticut is required to read at a higher level than his counterpart graduating from high school. In an interview with a staff member of the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, which prepares the high school equivalency tests, it was stated that reading capability indicators comprise 80 percent of the test. He also noted that standards for successful completion of the test in Connecticut could not be achieved by a projected 30 percent of high school seniors.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

18. ALL HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS IN THE STATE SHOULD BE GIVEN A STANDARDIZED READING EXAMINATION, ADMINISTERED BY THE STATE.

    STUDENTS WHO ACHIEVE AT LEAST AN EIGHTH GRADE READING LEVEL SHOULD BE AWARDED A CERTIFICATE SO STATING.

    SUCH A CERTIFICATE SHOULD BE REQUIRED FOR FULL-TIME ADMISSION TO ANY COMMUNITY COLLEGE, IN ADDITION TO THE HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA PRESENTLY REQUIRED.

18A. EACH ENTERING STUDENT, FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME, SHOULD BE TESTED FOR READING ABILITY. THOSE NOT OBTAINING AT LEAST A TENTH GRADE READING LEVEL SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO TAKE REMEDIAL COURSES TO BRING THEM UP TO THAT LEVEL.

Chapter VIII

FACULTY

Chapter VIII

FACULTY

The teaching faculty of the community colleges represents the single greatest group of employees in the community college system and their salaries the greatest single operating expense.

The faculty appears to be very competent and dedicated. Their professional credentials are of a very high caliber. They generally received high praise during our interviews with students and administrators.

The faculty members themselves expressed a great enthusiasm for community college teaching. They did, however, state that they suffer from low morale due to poor facilities and/or because of what they believe to be a system of low financial compensation for faculty and a slow and confusing promotion system.

Although salary levels for faculty at the community colleges are not as high as those of other components of Connecticut's higher education system, there is little evidence of unusual faculty attrition. This seems to indicate that while the faculty may not be completely pleased with their situation at the community colleges, they are being compensated at a level comparable with other available employment opportunities in the state.

Along with the faculty's concern for the problems in the promotion system, the Program Review Committee has found related problems in the present faculty evaluation system. The Committee believes, however, that the Community College Board of Trustees, by instituting proposed changes in the personnel policy manual for the community college system, will reduce most of the confusion created by the present policies, especially in the area of promotion and evaluation.

Another area of concern is the relatively large percentage of part-time faculty members employed in the system. It is considerably less expensive to hire four part-time faculty members to teach one course each (at $750 per course for a total cost of $3000) than to hire one full-time instructor who teaches four courses at an annual salary of $10,500. Because community colleges have been operating on tight budgets in recent years, some colleges have tended to rely on part-time faculty as an economy measure.

A community college instructor must be available for consultation and counseling with the students at times other than those when his class is in session. It is also very important for faculty at community colleges to be totally involved in curriculum development and in department committee work. Part-time faculty members cannot

devote the same amount of time to teaching and related duties as full-time faculty members can.

The community college system's Executive Director issued a statement in September, 1973, concerning the full-time/part-time faculty question. He stated: "The community colleges of Connecticut [should] establish as a rough guide a division of 20 percent of courses to be taught by part-time faculty and no less than 80 percent of courses offered to be taught by full-time faculty."

The Committee is aware that the above statement was originally issued as a guide for two colleges that were employing over 80 percent of their faculty full-time. However, the Committee finds that this guideline has even more application when directed at the majority of colleges who are presently employing less than 80 percent of their faculty full-time.

Chapter IX

HEALTH SERVICES

Chapter IX

HEALTH SERVICES

On November 16, 1970, the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges officially endorsed the goal of developing a program of health services at each college, during the hours of operation, that provides for immediate availability of a registered nurse and availability of a physician on call for medical emergencies.

However, nearly four years later, only Manchester Community College has developed its health care services to the level recommended by the Board. Several of the other colleges employ a part-time nurse, and at Mohegan Community College, members of the nursing faculty help out in emergencies. The majority of schools provide very limited medical care for their students.

The amount spent on health care varies widely among the colleges. According to the central office, Greater Hartford Community College spent $1250 on health services in 1972-73, while Manchester Community College reportedly spent $39,750. There is no apparent reason why some colleges have spent a great deal more than others on health care, and no correlation was found between enrollment and amount expended.

There appears to be a great deal of confusion at the central office concerning exactly which colleges do have medical services and what the annual costs of these services are. According to the central office, six of the colleges have implemented the goals outlined above (Chart A, below). However, this list of schools does not match the central office's list of schools that spend money on health care services (Chart B, below), nor does it match the Committee's observations of facilities at the various colleges.

Table V

Health Services Availability at Community Colleges

Colleges Which Have Fully Implemented the Board's Goals	Amounts Spent on Health Services, by College	
Mattatuck	Mattatuck	19,948
Manchester	Manchester	39,750
Greater Hartford	Greater Htfd.	1,250
Northwestern	Northwestern	0
Mohegan	Mohegan	0
Norwalk	Norwalk	0
	S. Central	22,500
	Middlesex	6,500

At Northwestern, the Committee was told that no nursing services were available. At Greater Hartford, only a

part-time nurse was on hand.

Because the $39,750 figure reported by the central office appeared unusually high, the staff contacted Manchester to determine which items were included in this figure. The College reported that its annual medical services budget was only $13,772.

Clearly, the central office is unaware of whether or not the colleges are meeting the medical service goals outlined by the Board of Trustees in 1970.

The Program Review Committee agrees with the Board that health care services are a vital part of a community college operation. The Committee believes that health services should be operated at each community college and that each should provide emergency medical care, health education and counseling, and the maintenance of health records on all students.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

19. EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE SHOULD DEVELOP A HEALTH SERVICE PROGRAM WHICH PROVIDES FOR (1) IMMEDIATE AVAILABILITY OF A REGISTERED NURSE, AND (2) AVAILABILITY OF A PHYSICIAN ON CALL FOR MEDICAL EMERGENCIES.

20. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHOULD ENSURE THAT ADEQUATE FUNDING, PERSONNEL, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, AND EQUIPMENT ARE AVAILABLE TO MEET THIS NEED.

Chapter X

DAY CARE

Chapter X

DAY CARE

For many community college students, finding someone to care for their small children while they are attending classes is difficult. Reliable babysitters are often far too expensive for students on a limited budget. In some towns, private day care centers do operate, but again, such facilities are very costly.

Community college day care facilities would provide on-site practical training opportunities for students in child care programs as well as provide inexpensive day care for children of community college students.

On April 15, 1974, the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges adopted the following resolution:

> "BE IT RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Trustees supports the principle of day-care centers at Community Colleges and requests the Council of Presidents to suggest from two to four alternate ways such centers might operate at the various Community Colleges; and further,
>
> THAT the Board of Trustees authorizes the individual colleges to establish, as auxiliary enterprises, such centers, provided that the centers are fully licensed, if necessary, and that the receipt and expenditure of monies conforms to policies and procedures established by the Comptroller, the Commissioner of Finance and Control, and other cognizant State agencies; and further,
>
> THAT each of the colleges is authorized to receive funds voted by its local student government, or from any other source, to help support its day-care center and to expend on behalf of its center such funds. receipts from day-care center tuition, and monies from

its Auxiliary Services Fund."

Only one of the colleges (Northwestern) now has day care services available on campus. Northwestern operates a day care center both as a service for its students and as a training experience for students in their child care program. At Mohegan and Manchester, parents have formed co-op day care centers and have rented space in local buildings.

The Program Review Committee agrees with the Board of Trustees that day care centers are helpful in the colleges for providing greater opportunity for parents with young children to benefit from a college education and to provide on-site practical training facilities for community college programs related to child care.

RECOMMENDATION:

21. PROGRAMS WHICH WOULD ENABLE A WIDE RANGE OF PEOPLE, INCLUDING STUDENTS WITH YOUNG CHILDREN, TO ENROLL IN COLLEGES SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED AT EACH COLLEGE.

Chapter XI

FACILITIES

Chapter XI

FACILITIES

Facilities at the various community colleges differ markedly. Some colleges are housed in spacious, attractive buildings that are a source of pride to their communities. Others are located in run-down and cramped quarters that are woefully inadequate.

South Central and Quinebaug Valley Community Colleges cannot hold classes during the day because they are housed in public high schools. Quinebaug, Tunxis, Asnuntuck, and South Central have no laboratory space and must rent science labs at local high schools. Several schools cannot provide student lounges and meeting rooms due to inadequate space. None of the colleges has space for library facilities that meet American Library Association standards. Classroom space is especially scarce at the newer schools such as Asnuntuck.

Hazardous conditions exist in several schools. The local fire marshall prohibited South Central Community College from holding classes in one of its buildings. Several colleges operate in former factories with unrefinished wooden floors, and questions have arisen concerning the safety of the new facility recently constructed for Middlesex Community College.

The accreditation and licensing of the colleges is constantly being threatened because of poor facilities. South Central Community College has been informed by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges and the Commission for Higher Education that it must find more adequate facilities or face loss of accreditation and license.

The 1974 General Assembly has moved to remedy the problem of inadequate facilities by appropriating approximately $20 million for the purchase and improvement of community college facilities. With this support from the General Assembly, the Program Review Committee is hopeful that every community college will soon be housed in a facility that will meet its needs.

RECOMMENDATION:

22. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHOULD ENSURE THAT ALL COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITIES ARE ADEQUATE FOR THE COLLEGES' NEEDS AND ARE SAFE FOR OCCUPANCY. SPECIAL ATTENTION SHOULD BE PAID TO IMPROVING FACILITIES AT THOSE SCHOOLS WHICH ARE HOUSED IN INFERIOR FACILITIES IN AN EFFORT TO EQUALIZE THE QUALITY AND SAFETY OF ALL COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITIES.

Chapter XII

INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Introduction

Asnuntuck Community College

Greater Hartford Community College

Housatonic Community College

Manchester Community College

Mattatuck Community College

Middlesex Community College

Mohegan Community College

Northwestern Connecticut Community College

Norwalk Community College

Quinebaug Valley Community College

South Central Community College

Tunxis Community College

Chapter XII

INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Introduction

This section presents individual descriptions of each of Connecticut's twelve community colleges.

These descriptions attempt to provide the reader with an overall impression of what each college is like: its strengths, its weaknesses, and its plans for the future.

The Committee noted with interest that although each college is unique, many of the same problem areas are found at all twelve colleges.

Asnuntuck Community College

Citizens from the north central area of the state first petitioned the General Assembly to establish a community college in their area in 1966. Following continued requests and a number of false starts, North Central Community College opened at Enfield in September of 1972. In February of 1973, the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges officially named the college Asnuntuck Community College.

Asnuntuck Community College is currently operating with limited facilities. Most classes are held in one small building (North School), with classrooms often serving more than one purpose. For example, the typing classroom

also serves as faculty offices and the Women's Center.

Administrative offices are located in the basement of the building and afford little privacy or quiet. Working conditions are poor due to inadequate space and the necessity for housing such mechanical equipment as telephone junction boxes in the offices. Counselors have neither adequate space nor privacy for holding sessions with students.

School administrators feel that the planned move to a new building in September will alleviate many of the problems in the current facility.

The College has a widely diverse student body of nearly 600 students, of which approximately 80 percent are part-time students. Almost 500 students are enrolled in transfer programs in the areas of liberal arts, liberal studies, accounting, and management. The remainder are in occupational programs such as data processing, executive secretary, marketing, retailing, legal and medical secretary, and pilot/management.

There are six full-time and 25 part-time faculty members with most administrators supplementing this number by also teaching courses. It is difficult for this small faculty to provide day and evening courses as well as a wide variety of community service programs, in addition to providing individual attention necessary to a student body

of such divergent interests, abilities, and experiences. However, the students seem quite satisfied with the dedication and skill of the faculty and administration.

Community service programs range from accounting to yoga and include such courses as organic gardening, film festivals, candle-making, and painting. Such courses draw enrollments between four and 150 students.

Future plans for Asnuntuck Community College depend, of course, on funding and the acquisition of new facilities. The major thrust of programs, however, is toward the occupational areas. Close cooperation between Asnuntuck and the regional vocational-technical school proposed for the Enfield-Suffield area is desired by the College's president. This desire ties in to the president's philosophy that the community colleges should serve the community's needs which, in this case, center around industry.

The most obvious asset of Asnuntuck Community College is its dynamic and dedicated faculty and administration. It appears that the staff has been able to function well and inspire student interest and spirit despite limitations imposed by poor facilities. While this dedication and spirit are not limited to Asnuntuck, they are especially evident against the relatively depressing backdrop of the school's facility.

One thing which sets Asnuntuck apart from any of its counterparts is the requirement that a student perform 25 hours of community service in order to graduate. The philosophy of the administration is that since the community provides the resources for the students to attend the College, the students have a responsibility of giving some form of service to the community in return.

There are now two major problems at Asnuntuck: the facility, and what the College staff feels to be intervention from other state agencies in school policy and administration.

The problem concerning inadequate facilities will be remedied this September when the College moves into its new quarters. However, the problem of intervention in the College's operation is an ongoing concern and must be solved on a system-wide basis (see Chapter III).

Greater Hartford Community College

Greater Hartford Community College was established in 1967 by the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges. The College opened with an enrollment of 388 students and has grown to over 1500 students as of the fall of 1973.

The State Commission for Higher Education has described Greater Hartford's facilities as "deplorable." The

College is located in a renovated brick factory building in a depressed area in South Hartford. The building is noisy and the neighborhood is definitely a drawback for many students who would like to attend evening courses at the College.

The majority of students work, and over 50 percent of the students receive some financial aid. However, the College also has a good percentage of students from high-income families. Two-thirds of the students are over 22 years of age.

Plans for the future were contingent upon finding adequate facilities for the College. Both the State Commission for Higher Education and the New England Association of Schools and Colleges had notified Greater Hartford that further licensing and accreditation would not be granted if new and adequate facilities were not acquired.

This problem has been resolved by the recent acquisition of the Phoenix Building on Woodland Street in Hartford.

When the move to the Phoenix Building is completed, the College plans to establish additional occupational courses and provide an extended community service program.

The enthusiasm and dedication of faculty, students, and staff are commendable, especially in light of the difficult

conditions under which the College has operated.

Greater Hartford has sought out federal and other grants with which to operate special programs. One particularly notable program is a secretarial program for Spanish-speaking women that is financed through grants from the Puerto Rican Businessmen's Association and the Aetna Life & Casualty Company. No state money is received for the bi-lingual program at the College.

A serious problem affecting the operation of Greater Hartford Community College is the excessive control placed on the College by the Department of Finance and Control. The administrators point out that there are "more than the necessary" controls for good accountability (see Chapter III).

Housatonic Community College

Housatonic Community College was established as a branch of Norwalk Community College in 1966. Operations began the following September in various rented facilities in the Stratford area. It became an independent member of the state system of community colleges in July, 1967.

In early 1971, Housatonic moved to its current facilities in a renovated factory building on Barnum Avenue in Bridgeport. Although this facility is one of the better community college facilities in the state,

Housatonic is already feeling the effects of limited space and the strictures of leasing facilities rather than owning them. School administrators are looking for a site that may be purchased for the College's permanent facility.

Current enrollment at Housatonic is about 2700 students. Thirty-five percent of these students are in the liberal arts and education areas, 15 percent in business administration, and the remainder in various technical and occupational programs. Fifteen hundred students attend on a part-time basis.

The College is staffed by 18 full-time administrators and 62 full-time faculty members. This staff is supplemented by varying numbers of part-time personnel.

Housatonic Community College offers a wide range of programs. In addition to the liberal arts and general education courses offered, there are such technical and occupational areas as secretarial science, law enforcement, health care, and library work. A program for training urban professional assistants (UPAP) to work in social service, government, and other occupations in metropolitan areas is also offered.

Housatonic provides a wide variety of community service programs, including a schedule of guest speakers

and courses ranging from ecology and business management to emergency medical treatment and pilots' ground school training. Programs are provided for inmates of the Bridgeport Correctional Center. Community services are tailored to the needs of the community and are based on the ability of the College to provide services and on input from the community as to its needs. One example is a course in interpersonal relations for supervisory personnel at the General Electric Corporation.

Several factors serve to make Housatonic Community College unique within the system. A $500,000 dollar art collection donated to the school gives the facility the appearance of an art museum.

Housatonic also provides a program specifically designed for members of labor unions. This offering, in addition to the UPAP courses, indicates an appreciation for the needs of industrial metropolitan areas.

Housatonic shares many needs and problems with the other schools in the community college system. Facilities are being outgrown, and additional funding is needed for some programs, especially in the areas of counseling and occupational programs.

Intervention in College policies by other state agencies is a sore point among faculty and administrators.

The staff members are critical of the student contact hour method of funding the colleges and suggest that basic support services such as library, health, counseling, and remedial programs are very difficult to operate when funding is tied so closely to head count.

Manchester Community College

Manchester Community College is the largest school in the system of regional community colleges. Established in 1963, it was operated by the town of Manchester until it became part of the state system in the fall of 1965.

Facilities consist of twelve buildings on a 160-acre site and an additional building on Hartford Road that is leased by the College. The main campus buildings are of modular pre-fab construction and are in use until the permanent campus is constructed. Three of these buildings are used for classrooms, two for faculty offices, and one for administrative personnel. A relatively large library is available to students and local residents.

Unlike most other community colleges in the system, Manchester has an auditorium with both indoor and outdoor stages. Shower and locker facilities are available on campus, and playing fields are being developed; however, there are no on-campus gymnasium facilities available to students at present.

Manchester Community College has an enrollment in excess of 4000 students from all over Connecticut and several other states and foreign countries. More than half of the students are enrolled in liberal arts or general studies programs. Over one thousand students are enrolled in business, commerce, and data processing programs, with about half that many in public service programs and the remainder in the health services.

The faculty consists of 86 full-time and 75 part-time personnel. Manchester is also one of the few community colleges with health services available to students.

Programs are offered in various divisions, including humanities and communications arts, mathematics, sciences and allied health, social science and public service, and inter-divisional courses in general studies and arts and sciences.

Various community service programs are offered, and several adjacent organizations add to the offerings of the college. Among these are the Institute of Local History, the MCC Film Center, and the Environmental Studies Center. Students also are able to take certain courses not offered at Manchester under the New England Regional Student Program and in the Industrial Technology Curriculum.

Mattatuck Community College

In 1967, the General Assembly authorized the establishment of a community college in the lower Naugatuck Valley area. The city of Waterbury leased Kennedy High School to the state at no cost for use as Mattatuck Community College. The College opened in September of 1967 with over 500 students enrolled.

Mattatuck Community College is now housed in three different locations. Classroom facilities are in two of these, on opposite sides of town. An attempt is made to schedule all classes in a particular program at one campus in order to reduce cross-town trips.

Enrollment at Mattatuck reached over 2500 students this past fall. About 60 percent of the students are full-time. The average age is about 19 years, significantly lower than at most other community colleges in Connecticut. More than two-thirds of the full-time freshmen come directly to the College after graduation from high school.

An extensive community service program makes specialized courses available to people within the Naugatuck Valley area. Numerous cultural events, such as a film series in art and philosophy, a lecture series, and concerts, are sponsored by the College and are open to the public.

Mattatuck's plans for the future center around the Central Naugatuck Valley Higher Education Center, which is to be developed in Waterbury. In 1969, the General Assembly authorized the establishment of a single campus for Waterbury State Technical College, the Waterbury Branch of the University, and Mattatuck Community College. There is a great deal of uncertainty as to when facilities will actually be constructed as funding has not been forthcoming.

The College also has plans for increasing opportunities for occupational education. A fine arts program and several health occupations programs are in planning stages.

The Mattatuck students who were interviewed are generally pleased with the College. Several students pointed out that without the low-cost, close-to-home education provided at Mattatuck they would never have a chance to attend college. Faculty members expressed very positive feelings about the Mattatuck students and indicated that, as a whole, the students are exceptionally hard-working and challenging to teach.

The College has developed, through its community service and public relations programs, a very positive image in the community.

Due to budget constraints, Mattatuck has had to refuse

admission to a substantial number of students. Some prospective students have been put on waiting lists and eventually have been admitted; others have been referred to other institutions that were still accepting students. But some prospective students simply were not served. This admissions problem is a severe one for any college that is mandated to have an open door policy.

According to Mattatuck administrators, "unneccessary" budget constraints placed on the College by the Department of Finance and Control have caused the College delay, frustration, and occasional embarrassment. The administrators agree that Finance and Control should ensure that the College does not exceed its allocated budget, but argue that present constraints go beyond good fiscal control. "Finance and Control should be policemen, not policymakers," said one administrator (see Chapter III).

Middlesex Community College

In 1966, Middlesex Community College was established as a branch of Manchester Community College. The College became independent in 1968. From its inception until last fall, the College was housed in facilities of the Middletown public school system and Connecticut Valley Hospital. The hospital facilities ranged from an abandoned prison to a drug patient ward.

The current facility of Middlesex Community College consists of three modern buildings on a 38-acre site. The buildings were designed by the school staff (an architect was only available for final approval) and are currently being leased by the school under a lease-purchase arrangement. The college administrators feel this campus should be purchased in order to stop the drain in operating expenses caused by lease payments, and place this cost under capital funds.

Middlesex Community College has an enrollment of over 1800 students who come from a wide area of the state. The student body is predominantly female, and about 60 percent of the students attend on a part-time basis. The average age is nearly 30 years old.

The College faculty consists of 45 full-time members and a number of part-time personnel, which varies according to the needs of the institution. The administration has expressed the need for more staff in areas such as community service, athletics, and various other administrative areas. Another pressing need is for a school nurse. Middlesex is currently operating without one, thus health services (and the counseling that usually accompanies these services) are not available.

Middlesex offers a wide range of programs. Many students are enrolled in general studies programs, and

courses in such areas as business administration, government services, secretarial, and health services are being offered to increasing numbers of students.

Community service programs in such areas as income tax, wills, various arts and crafts, and special job areas, such as swimming pool operation, are offered. The College expects to increase these offerings, but the limitations of funding make it extremely difficult to do so.

The College is currently preparing a uniform procedures manual which is expected to be the first such manual in the state community college system. This codification of procedures combined with the projected move to a Planning Programing Budgeting System (PPBS) should place Middlesex in the unique administrative position of having the most advanced planning anc accountability system of any state community college.

Despite the professed need for purchase and expansion of facilities, the Middlesex campus is more modern and spacious than facilities at most other community colleges in Connecticut.

In addition to the problem of potential overcrowding, Middlesex Community College personnel have voiced concerns over intervention and funding, as have their counterparts in other parts of the system. Excessive paperwork and

decision making by non-educational personnel in state agencies outside the higher education system make effective and efficient administration difficult for the College staff (see Chapter III).

Future plans for Middlesex include purchase and expansion of the campus and the provision of certain services, such as health services, that are not yet available. College personnel also plan to add a forestry program and to assume the nurses' training programs being dropped by the local hospitals.

Mohegan Community College

Mohegan Community College is the result of legislation passed in the 1969 General Assembly authorizing the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges to establish a college in the Norwich area. The College opened in September of 1970 with 350 students.

Mohegan Community College was originally housed in two centers, one in New London and one in Norwich. In 1973, the College acquired the campus of a parochial girls' school that was closing. This campus, located in suburban Norwich, includes modern classrooms, science labs, a gymnasium, a large cafeteria/lounge, playing fields, and room for expansion as the College grows. This facility is undoubtedly the finest in Connecticut's community college system.

In the fall of 1973, 673 students were attending Mohegan on a full-time basis, and 513 were part-time students. An active credit extension program enrolled an additional 136 students.

Over half the students at Mohegan are over 22 years of age, and approximately 60 percent of the student body is expecting to eventually transfer to four-year colleges.

In the near future, the College hopes to expand its effectiveness in the community by extending its programs beyond the present perimeters of college freshman-sophomore levels. It has plans to develop advanced placement programs for high school students and to work on "third-year" programs such as the existing nursing program. The College also intends to expand occupational programs and its offerings in the community service area.

The extensive community service program at Mohegan is to be commended. The College has recently appointed a full-time Director of Community Services who is developing a number of cooperative programs with area organizations and institutions. Through its "Gateways" program, college courses are brought to various towns within the region, making them more accessible to the people. The College lends its facilities, without cost, to various community groups.

Nearly 60 percent of Mohegan graduates transfer to

four-year colleges, an unusually high figure for a community college. This figure is expected to decline somewhat as the College establishes more occupational programs.

Members of the small student personnel staff expressed the concern that they were unable to provide the in-depth counseling services needed by many students.

Administrators and staff expressed a concern about the College's relationship with the Department of Finance and Control. "Decisions on educational policy matters are being made by second, third, and fourth level clerks who have no idea of the implications of their actions," complained one administrator. Particularly annoying to the College staff were stringent fiscal policies relating to out-of-state travel for professional conferences and the denial of promotions even when recommended by the College president and the Board of Trustees. Overly restrictive and time-consuming purchasing procedures were also criticized (see Chapter III).

The student contact hour method of funding community colleges also drew heavy fire from the College faculty and staff. Faculty members pointed to a need for excessively large classes in some areas in order to provide the smaller classes necessary for occupational and remedial courses. Faculty members agreed that 50

students in an English class is simply too many, especially when many of the students need individual attention in order to succeed. The faculty suggested that it would be helpful to devise a new funding formula based on the colleges' missions and programs rather than on mere headcount (see Chapter VI).

Northwestern Connecticut Community College

Northwestern Connecticut Community College was founded in 1965. It became a part of the state system of community colleges with the passage of Public Act 330 (Connecticut General Assembly, 1965). It was accredited by the State Commission for Higher Education in 1967 and, subsequently, by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

Northwestern is located in Winsted on a site purchased from the town of Winchester in 1969. The main buildings of the campus house administrative and faculty offices, an auditorium, a cafeteria, and some classrooms and art studios. A former supermarket, leased and renovated by the school, houses the library, learning center, various classrooms, laboratories, and other offices.

Over 1700 students are enrolled, of which almost 1000 are classified as part-time. Fifty-six percent of the student body is female. Almost half of the students are

enrolled in general arts and sciences programs, with large numbers in art and criminal justice, and the remainder in such areas as business, health care, and secretarial studies.

There are 47 full-time faculty members and varying numbers of part-time personnel. Most administrative personnel also teach classes. The college is open 65 hours a week, yet it is staffed and funded at a normal 35-hour week level. Despite the strains imposed by such a system, rapport among faculty, staff, and students appears to be quite good.

Northwestern offers several varieties of community service. In addition to evening adult education courses, there are various non-credit programs in areas such as child care and photography. Cultural activities (films, poetry readings, and concerts) are provided, and a speakers' bureau presents programs ranging from the history of Winsted and quilting to subjects such as Watergate and Solzhenitsyn.

Northwestern shares most of the system-wide problems of the community colleges. Funding and staffing levels are considered inadequate by the administration for a school operating 65 hours a week. Certain facilities need expansion and improvement, especially parking facilities.

Improving the parking situation is one of the planning

priorities of the administration at Northwestern. Additional facilities are needed in other areas also, especially instructional space.

Northwestern is the only college in Litchfield County and is the only community college in New England that offers a college education to deaf persons.

Norwalk Community College

Norwalk Community College, founded in 1961, is the oldest community college in the state. Originally established and operated by the Norwalk Board of Education, it was transferred to the state in 1966. The College has grown from 143 students in 1961 to 2656 in 1973.

The College formerly leased facilities at two Norwalk public schools. This arrangement was far from ideal because it restricted classroom use to late afternoon and evening, and the two facilities were a ten-minute drive from each other. Trailers were used to provide extra space needed for counseling facilities, faculty offices, a library, and administrative offices.

In 1972, the College acquired leased facilities in a former manufacturing plant in Norwalk. This property consists of one large main building and smaller science lab and student center buildings.

Although the facilities are large in comparison to many community colleges, space will most likely be inadequate if a larger number of students must be accommodated. Perhaps the most urgent need at this time is for additional parking. Presently, there are about 380 parking spaces; administrators estimate that about 1000 are needed.

Some 60 percent of the students are part-time. The average age is about 25 years, although ages range from 16 to 66.

Students at Norwalk come from a variety of ethnic and income groups and have, according to one faculty member, an "amazing range of intellectual abilities, going from the marginal student to genius-level students."

A number of citizens in the area are reached through the College's community service program. Courses offered in this area include R.N. refresher courses, English as a second language, human relations for police officers, and business/industrial management seminars. Community groups such as Headstart and a local tenant's association also are encouraged to use the College facilities for educational purposes.

The College is examining various ways in which it can expand its services. A major goal is to open a branch campus in downtown Stamford in the near future, and the

College is also exploring the possibility of leasing a fourth building on the Wilson Avenue campus. New occupational programs are being developed to broaden the College's curriculum.

The Director of Institutional Research prepares annual graduate follow-up reports that track Norwalk graduates after they leave the School. These reports include data on both students who transferred to four-year colleges and students who immediately sought employment. The information contained in these reports enables the faculty and administration to determine how well Norwalk students are prepared for the future and also provides information as to which occupational programs are successful and which need improvement.

Cramped space is a problem at Norwalk, particularly a lack of sufficient parking space.

College faculty and administrators were quite upset about intervention in the College's affairs by the Department of Finance and Control and other state agencies. The College has had a great deal of difficulty getting approval to purchase the type of equipment it feels is most beneficial for its own use, even when funds are in its budget to cover the expense.

Restrictions on out-of-state travel were said to be

particularly stringent. Faculty and staff are reportedly unable to attend meetings in nearby New York, at minimal cost, because out-of-state travel funds are not made available. However, trips inside Connecticut, even if they are of longer distance than trips to New York, are usually approved. Reasons for disapprovals are very rarely given by Finance and Control.

The promotion system is also an issue at Norwalk. Morale suffers markedly when faculty members recommended for promotion by their peers, their College president, and the Board of Trustees are eventually denied the promotion at a higher level.

Quinebaug Valley Community College

The General Assembly authorized the establishment of Quinebaug Valley Community College in 1969. However, funding for the College was not approved until 1971. In September of that year the College opened with over 200 students.

Temporary leased facilities for the College are located at the Harvard Ellis Technical School in Danielson. Science lab classes are held at the Killingly High School. A moveable building on the Ellis Campus houses the College library. One trailer parked on the Ellis grounds is used as a very small student lounge, while another trailer serves

as the business office. Faculty offices also are located in trailers. Administrators' offices are located in an old house near the regional airport, several miles from the Ellis campus.

Because high school courses are carried on during the day at the College's leased facilities, Quinebaug is able to offer its courses only during the late afternoon and evening hours.

Aside from the student lounge trailer that can accommodate perhaps ten or fifteen students at a time, there is no area where students can gather before and after classes to study or socialize.

Facilities for student counseling are not adequate to ensure privacy. Only partial partitions divide some counseling areas, and space is quite cramped.

The student body at Quinebaug is quite heterogeneous. Currently, there are nearly 500 students enrolled in regular credit courses. Over half are part-time students, and about 60 percent are women. Ages range from 17 to 97 years.

Because a number of students at Quinebaug need remedial work before they are fully prepared to take college-level courses, students are tested when they first enroll to determine their academic strengths and weaknesses and are

counseled to take courses appropriate for them.

In addition to its regular enrollment, Quinebaug Valley Community College also reaches a large number of people through its office of community services. Programs in small business management, expectant parent training, modern dance, and advertising have been offered. These courses are run on a self-supporting basis (excluding administrative costs).

The major plan for Quinebaug's future is to acquire a permanent campus of its own. The site selection committee of the College's Regional Advisory Council has chosen a site. Plans for a new building have been drawn up, and funds are now needed for construction.

Plans are also being developed that will allow the College to meet a variety of educational needs in the northeastern part of the state. Additional career programs are being planned, and offerings in the community service and liberal arts programs also will be strengthened.

The overwhelming enthusiasm of Quinebaug's students, faculty, and administrators about their school is perhaps the most striking thing the Committee found during its visit to the College. However, it is tempered by their disappointment over not having facilities of their own. Day courses would be much more convenient than evening

courses for many older women and night shift workers in the community. A place for students to congregate would give students a chance to develop friends at the College. A permanent facility would attract students who do not like the present high school atmosphere of the College.

Faculty and administrators are quite concerned about what they consider to be interference from other state agencies. They point to the necessity of getting the Department of Finance and Control's approval for any expenditure of out-of-state travel funds as a severe problem, since Finance and Control reportedly disapproves such requests without giving reasons. Faculty and staff agree that the decisions made by Finance and Control go well beyond the realm of good fiscal control and extend into matters of educational policy.

Faculty and administrators at Quinebaug are also concerned with the present method of funding community colleges through the student contact hour formula. The faculty are especially disturbed about the large class sizes required by the SCH formula, and indicated that the formula is a disservice to new, small, community-oriented schools like Quinebaug.

South Central Community College

South Central Community College opened in June, 1968.

The early years of its development were filled with controversy over administrative and racial issues. It has been reported that faculty morale suffered from the lack of appropriate promotions and the general turmoil under which the School has operated. Although it appears that there has been some stabilization, controversies continue to this day.

One major problem area is the state of the facilities. Classes, held in a portion of Wilbur Cross High School in New Haven, are limited to the hours following the regular school day, thus no classes are held prior to 3:00 P.M. Additional facilities are available in an unused armory around the corner from Cross High, but these have been disapproved for classes by the city fire marshal. The armory now is used basically for faculty offices. Administrators, faculty, and students alike agree on the need for a permanent site.

Over 1350 students are currently enrolled at South Central. The majority of these students are considered full-time. There are about 100 more female students than male. Although students come from nearly 50 Connecticut towns and several other states and foreign countries, the majority are from the immediate New Haven area. The potential impact of South Central on the city itself appears to be quite substantial because of this. The

relatively high percentage of minority students (over 25 percent) also indicates possible areas of further impact on students, who, as a general rule, are considered educationally disadvantaged.

Another area of controversy is the faculty. It appears that the original problem concerned a lack of qualifications among some faculty members. The transfer of these faculty members and the addition and promotion of others seems to have remedied this problem to a certain extent. The faculty consists of about 40 full-time personnel and a varying number of part-time personnel.

South Central offers courses in liberal arts, general studies, business, health services, and public service, among others. The largest percentages of students are enrolled in general studies and liberal arts, with considerable numbers in child care and business administration programs.

Community service programs include educational expansion, social outreach, personal counseling, and community needs programs on consumer education, income tax, and other cultural, recreational, and educational needs. Concern about Veterans Education (CAVE) programs for dropouts and those wanting additional skills for college work help the veteran to further his education.

An instructional resources center is in operation to provide self-paced learning in various areas, but the problem of having no facility to house it (aside from the armory mentioned above) makes its true value more potential than actual, though it has had some success.

The most unique feature of South Central Community College seems to be its ability to survive. Through its historic turmoil and in the face of almost intolerable facilities, the College continues to fulfill its purpose to the best of its ability.

However, the divisiveness of South Central must be greatly reduced in order for the College to survive. Improved facilities are a first priority need in solving the School's problems.

Tunxis Community College

In 1969, the General Assembly mandated that the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges establish a regional college to serve the New Britain-Bristol area. In 1970, Tunxis Community College was established in Farmington to comply with the Assembly's requirement. Nearly 500 students enrolled at Tunxis during its first semester of operation.

The College is located in a former shopping center in suburban Farmington at the intersection of two major state

routes. The facilities are modern, and plenty of nearby parking is available. Science laboratory courses are taught at a nearby public high school.

Because of increasing enrollment at the College, classroom space has become inadequate. A number of evening classes must be held at other locations due to this lack of space. Counseling facilities are very cramped and do not provide adequate privacy. The cafeteria/student lounge holds only a small percentage of the student body.

Enrollment at Tunxis reached approximately 2500 students this year, about 60 percent of whom are part-time. About two-thirds of the students are enrolled in career-oriented programs.

A community service program operates on a limited basis, with leisure craft courses and various credit courses offered. About 500 students a year enroll in community service courses.

The College has plans for expansion of classroom facilities and for expansion of its occupational training courses. Funding permitting, the College would like to hire additional full-time faculty members. The College also is moving towards the implementation of a Program Budget System.

The Committee is particularly concerned about the high

percentage of part-time faculty on the Tunxis staff. Presently only about 40 percent of class sections are covered by full-time faculty. The college administration has made the decision to hire part-time lecturers because of severe budget constraints. This is the only way the College has been able to have sufficient funds for buying needed equipment.

While the part-time faculty appears to be qualified, these faculty members are rarely available to see students outside of class hours, and they do not serve on any committees.

APPENDIX

Agency Response

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Connecticut
Community
Colleges

1280 Asylum Avenue
Hartford 06105 232-4817

July 1, 1974

Mr. George L. Schroeder
Director
Program Review Committee
Room 402, State Capitol
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

Accompanying this letter is a statement prepared in response to the draft report on Community Colleges prepared for the Program Review Committee. In general, we support the recommendations listed. There are on occasion a few modifications or stated warnings which are given to indicate that the recommendations might be carried out in a manner which would have a negative impact on the Community Colleges, even though we realize that is not the intent of the recommendations themselves.

The report seems to draw rather strongly the issue of whether there is to be a system of Community Colleges in which the similarity of programs is the major characteristic of the total operation or whether there is to be emphasis on the Community College in a region reflecting the post-secondary, two-year college needs of that region. The establishment of Community Colleges throughout this nation emphasized local community characteristics dominating programs and functions. We believe this emphasis must be preserved if we are, in fact, to have "Regional" Community Colleges.

The Board certainly wishes to make clear that it is looking forward to the time when the Management Information System now being developed on a trial basis in some units of public higher education can be made applicable to all of public higher education so that our staff and this Board will have efficient means for its own post-auditing methods, its own studies and compiling of statistics, and its own opportunities to make studies of the end product of the efforts of the Board, and its college administrators and faculty.

We appreciate the effort that the Program Review Committee staff has made, realizing that it is difficult to study various written reports and to obtain a feeling and understanding of the operation of the Community Colleges in this state.

The comments included in our reply are therefore intended to present some of that needed balance in a total review of the Community Colleges which can best come from those of us who have been involved more consistently, month in and month out, in Community College activities over a period of years.

We particularly appreciate the understanding expressed in this report that the Legislature must clarify the role of the Community Colleges in job training, continuing and adult education and related activities so proper funding can occur and services can be rendered to thousands of additional citizens in our state as in other states. We are pleased to see the recognition that many vocational/occupational curricula are more expensive and a recommendation for more funding for these programs. We have found the Program Review Committee staff to be fair and objective, to consider contrary observations, and to seek an understanding of our past problems as well as to note that overall the colleges have had considerable success in their first eight years.

Sincerely,

Roger B. Bagley
Chairman

RBB/js
Enclosure

The response to the Report of the Program Review Committee entitled, "Community Colleges in the State of Connecticut" is divided into the following sections:

A. Actual Recommendations

B. General Topics and Issues

A. Actual Recommendations

Recommendations 1-7.

1. The General Assembly should pass legislation which clearly defines the authorities and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees of Community Colleges and holds them accountable for their activities under this legislation.

2. The Board of Trustees for Community Colleges should clearly define the authorities and responsibilities of Community College administrators and hold them accountable for these activities.

3. The General Assembly should pass legislation clearly defining the authorities and responsibilities of the control agencies.

4. In keeping with the authorities and responsibilities mandated, the Department of Finance and Control should issue clear and concise standard regulations to all State agencies, indicating the way in which all requests are processed and the criteria necessary for completed requests.

4a. These regulations should be submitted to the Legislative Regulations Review Committee for approval.

5. In the event that a decision made by the Board of Trustees will have an impact on an inter-regional or statewide basis, the Board should be notified to that effect by the appropriate control agency.

5a. Such notification should include a complete description and analysis of the impacts as seen by the control agency and/or other appropriate executive agencies and citizen groups.

6. Operations of the Community College system and the control agencies should be conducted with maximum possible communication and cooperation between them.

7. Any control agency disapproval shall be accompanied by a complete explanation of the reasons for the disapproval.

Comments. The first set of recommendations includes Nos. 1-7, which are related in nature and purpose. The Board of Trustees supports these recommendations as it

believes they are intended; however, the substance of the regulations called for in Nos. 3 and 4 is critical. If such regulations do not provide the means for the Board of Trustees to govern the operation of the Community Colleges in a manner conducive to efficient management and to the attainment of proper educational goals for Community College students, nothing will have been gained. For example, No. 4 could involve a set of standard regulations even more restrictive on the governing role of the Board of Trustees than exists currently. No. 3 must be drafted so the Board clearly has sufficient authority and decision-making opportunity to operate the Community Colleges effectively and to give the necessary policy leadership to educational goals suitable for a public Community College.

Recommendations 8 and 9.

8. The General Assembly should repeal Section 10-326(3) of the General Statutes and substitute clear, concise and meaningful definitions of the missions of the Regional Community College system.

9. The Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges should provide clear and meaningful guidelines for the colleges to help them determine their role in the state higher education system, especially in regard to assigning priority among the colleges' missions and determining what programs are appropriate for carrying out the various missions.

Comments. The Board believes the statement of philosophy for Community Colleges (attached) adopted May 10, 1971, provides reasonable guidelines for college administrators familiar with the Community College mission. We believe the Community College presidents understand this statement and are willing to implement it. The Board of Trustees has already, on several occasions, clearly emphasized directly to the Community College presidents and to the Executive Director that occupational/vocational curricula, credit and non-credit, are priority programs, but the Board also realizes that funds, staff, facilities and equipment have been lacking, something the report of the Program Review Committee itself fully acknowledges. We also believe we must not be over directive otherwise the Community Colleges will not be able to reflect the local-regional characteristics needed.

10. The Commission for Higher Education should institute a uniform transfer system for the constituent units of higher education in the state. This system should mandate transfer requirements and define the general structure and content of courses to the satisfaction of all constituent sub-systems of the state higher education system.

Comments. The Board of Trustees strongly supports Recommendation 10 and points out that the Community College presidents, Executive Director, and several Community College counselors have sought a uniform transfer policy similar to that of several other states.

Recommendation 11.

11. The Board of Trustees should ensure that the necessary follow-up and other appropriate information on transfer, occupation, and community service programs be available for decision-making.

Comments. The Board concurs with No. 11, but in fairness to itself, and particularly in fairness to its professional staff, it must indicate the following:

The report makes no reference to the fact that in 1970-71 and 1971-72 the Board's staff developed excellent working relations and a system for the sharing of information on transfer students with the four State Colleges and the University of Connecticut. A yearly follow-up study of transfer students was implemented.

The Board has had a staff member who clearly had this responsibility stated in his job description as follows: "Coordinates and conducts research on transfer students to the State Colleges, UConn, and private colleges." The individual holding the position was loaned full-time in July, 1972, to the Commission for Higher Education to help prepare the Master Plan for Higher Education. The assignment lasted into December of 1973, and at that time the same individual, on request of the State Board for Academic Awards, has served that Board and recently was named as its executive head. Had the position been active for the Community Colleges during this period, yearly studies of transfer students as inaugurated in 1971-72 would have continued. This position will be activated again by September, 1974.

In regard to community service programs in operation, the Board of Trustees receives a yearly report on these programs. We recognize the fact that with clarification of the role of Community Colleges to provide community services, our programs can be more extensive.

Recommendation 12.

12. The General Assembly should pass legislation combining the Boards of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges and for State Technical Colleges.

Comments. The Board of Trustees wishes to verify the fact that in 1971 and 1972 it made known verbally and in written statements to the Education Committee of the State Legislature that it supported a single Board of Trustees for Community Colleges and Technical Colleges in Connecticut. It does, therefore, support this recommendation.

Recommendation 13.

13. The General Assembly should pass legislation clearly defining the community service mission of the Community Colleges.

Comments. The Board of Trustees concurs with this recommendation. The material pertaining to it, however, underestimates what central office staff know about community service operations in the colleges themselves.

Recommendations 14, 15 and 15a.

14. The Board of Trustees should issue such guidelines and regulations concerning community services as are necessary to ensure that this mission is fulfilled.

15. The individual college administrators should be responsible for assessing community needs and designing programs to meet these needs.

15a. These decisions should be made with the input of all appropriate advisory groups and community leaders.

Comments. The Board supports these recommendations and believes the colleges have been charged with these responsibilities. It calls attention to the fact that No. 15 is, when carried out, the major reason why there is a great variance in community service activities among the Community Colleges, both as to characteristics and amount. Communities vary considerably. The vitality of many educational and service agencies varies considerably in regions of the state. This in turn affects the nature and characteristics of Community College community service programs.

Recommendations 16-16c.

16. The General Assembly should alter the method of funding Community Colleges to provide for designated appropriations for the following eight broad categories: library and learning resource centers, plant maintenance and operations, student services, administration and general expenses, community services, guidance, remediation, and instruction.

16a. Enrollment figures should be used only as a basis for funding instructional costs.

16b. Occupational programs should be funded at a higher level than college transfer and general programs. These levels should realistically reflect cost differentials, taking into account such factors as class size and equipment costs.

16c. A third level of funding could be utilized for supporting health services occupational programs if necessary.

Comments. The Board of Trustees has reservations concerning Recommendation 16. The crucial question is, will legislators decide they know the categorical needs of the colleges better than the Board of Trustees? Certainly No. 16, if carried out, will limit the use of the knowledge of professional staff and the Board of Trustees of the programs and needs of the Community Colleges unless their recommendations are honored. This proposed system will not aid in improving the program and service operations of the Community Colleges if the Legislature cuts one or two categories and raises another. We believe the WICHE formula being developed by the State Budget Office for public higher education serves as an ample division of operating funds. These are instruction (which has subgroups); research (which has a subsection applicable to Community Colleges); public service (which covers community service and adult education); academic support (which includes libraries and other learning media); student services (which includes counseling); and institutional support (which includes administrative and plant operations). Perhaps further consultation can result in a mutual compromise since several obviously are the same general category.

The Board reminds every reader of the report and of these comments that it has for years sought additional funding for occupational curricula and for allied health curricula; therefore, these recommendations are strongly supported.

Recommendation 17.

17. The Board of Trustees should establish and mandate criteria for the minimum level of counseling needed at each institution. These criteria should be based on the collections of meaningful information from the colleges, program evaluation, and research and information from other states and appropriate sources.

Comments. The Board concurs with the recommendation and hopes the Legislature will be willing to fund what is needed. A step in this direction was made in the 1974 session.

Recommendation 18.

18. All high school seniors in the state should be given a standardized reading examination, administered by the state. Students who achieve at least an eighth grade reading level should be awarded a certificate so stating. Such a certificate should be required for admission to any Community College, in addition to the high school diploma presently required.

Comments. This recommendation does not pertain to the Community Colleges and the Board of Trustees. While in general sympathy with the recommendation, the Board has reservations about any requirement strictly enforced which would require a reading certificate, for there are many adults who can profit from specialized training courses related to their skills who cannot read at the eighth grade level. If this recommendation in practice is interpreted to refer clearly to the entrance of full-time students in a Community College, it is acceptable if it can be handled so as not to limit opportunities expected under equal opportunity legislation and regulations.

Recommendation 18a.

18a. Each entering student, full-time or part-time, should be tested for reading ability. Those not obtaining at least a tenth grade reading level should be required to take remedial courses to bring them up to that level.

Comments. The Board reiterates that it has sought additional funds for remedial programs and fully concurs with the concept of additional effort in reading and basic math needs to occur for many entering students. College officials are anxious to have more staff, smaller sections in remedial courses, and more individualized learning materials and equipment.

Recommendations 19 and 20.

19. Each Community College should develop a health service program which provides for (1) immediate availability of a registered nurse, and (2) availability of a physician on call for medical emergencies.

20. The Board of Trustees should ensure that adequate funding, personnel, physical facilities, and equipment are available to meet this need.

Comments. The Board of Trustees supports these recommendations. It must stress, however, that to do these things there must be more funds provided and less harrassment from other State agencies which in the past have cooperated reluctantly in establishing health care and nursing positions. (See comments in Part B regarding health care.)

Recommendation 21.

21. Programs which would enable a wide range of people, including students with young children to enroll in colleges should be developed and implemented at each college.

Comments. The Board supports No. 21 and notes that the report of the Program Review Committee recognizes the Board has taken action in regard to the need for day-care centers.

Recommendation 22.

22. The Board of Trustees should ensure that all Community College facilities are adequate for the colleges' needs and are safe for occupancy. Special attention should be paid to improving facilities at those schools which are housed in inferior facilities in an effort to equalize the quality and safety of all Community College facilities.

Comments. The Board of Trustees supports this recommendation with the understanding that all readers of the report are aware that the Board of Trustees must act in conjunction with four to six other State agencies which have as much, or more, to say about the extent and the quality of Community College facilities as the Board of Trustees. Any one of these agencies can block efforts of the Board to secure adequate facilities: the Commission for Higher Education, the Department of Public Works, the Department of Finance & Control, the Bond Commission, and the Governor. Conversely, of course, every one of these agencies can act, and has acted on several occasions, to assist the Board of Trustees. We are appreciative of their cooperation. The point is, the recommendation says the Board of Trustees "should ensure that all Community College facilities are adequate..." The fact is there is no way the Board of Trustees, acting by itself, can ensure this. Therefore, the recommendation is of little value as it now reads. The Board has already spent weeks, and staff have spent months, giving "special attention" to improving facilities at those colleges which are housed in "inferior facilities." The recommendation should read, "The State Legislature, the Commission for Higher Education, the Department of Public Works, the Department of Finance & Control, the Bond Commission, and the Governor should cooperate fully with the Board of Trustees to ensure. . ."

B. General Topics and Issues

Funding. While at various points the report refers to a lack of adequate funding by nature of comments and recognition of the lack of staff (e.g., counselors), it fails to bring out clearly that the basic problems faced by the Board of Trustees and its staff are those of (1) insufficient yearly operational funds, and (2) inadequate support for facilities. The Board believes the foremost recommendation, based on several pages of material in the report and several of the recommendations, should be to improve (1) the yearly operational support level per student, and (2) funds for facilities and support by other State agencies to secure facilities with available funds.

Liberal Arts, General Education, Occupational Curricula. The material relating to these topics does not reflect the conviction of the Board of Trustees, nor does it recognize directions given to the colleges by the Board. Further, not fully recognized is the fact that a sizeable portion of the usual Community College occupational/vocational curricula effort is in Connecticut the responsibility of the State Technical Colleges.

First, the Board of Trustees disagrees with the assumption that the general education curricula exists primarily as an adjunct to the transfer curricula. We believe it has as much value and versatility in assisting students to hold jobs as it has as preparation for a four-year college career. Several of these general education programs can be and are used as a means of securing a general background in literature, social science, and physical science which provides useful knowledge for skills needed in employment. Elective hours are frequently used to develop a special interest of a student which is unrelated to transfer and is employment oriented. In conclusion, the general education curriculum does not exist primarily

as a bridge to the senior institutions. We appreciate having called to our attention that many faculty and counselors in our system still look upon the general education curriculum as transfer-oriented. We shall take steps to adjust these concepts to that of seeing the general education curriculum primarily as a base for personal satisfaction and/or as a base for employment in vocational/occupational areas.

Second, the material at one point implies the concept of emphasis on occupational/vocational curricula is a recent interest of students. It may be true for many students, but this is incorrect in terms of the posture of the Board of Trustees. From the beginning, the Board of Trustees has emphasized the need for occupational/vocational curricula and has stressed this as a priority function as soon as any one of the Community Colleges could practically implement such programs. The reasons cited in the report for emphasis on the transfer and general education curricula exist; however, of equal or more relevance are these reasons: (1) a lack of funding which subsequent material in the report makes clear has occurred; (2) the painstaking effort required to work with outside professional groups in the development of occupational programs, sometimes taking two or three years to develop and get licensed by such groups (e.g., nursing); (3) the difficulty of securing reliable employment data for jobs seemingly needed which in turn help determine if a particular program is needed; (4) some confusion until 1974 on the delineation of curricula responsibilities of the Community Colleges and Technical Colleges in areas bordering on technical education (This was clarified early in 1974 by the Master Plan, which resulted in a new attitude by the Commission for Higher Education.); (5) lack of facilities, which is also otherwise later recognized in this report; and (6) the fact that up until 1972, there was a backlog of students qualified to enter four-year public and private colleges who were not being admitted to these institutions. Therefore, the need to provide programs for these students was one of the chief responsibilities of the Community Colleges, and they met this need quite successfully.

The use of the expression, "open enrollment" to describe Connecticut's open-door admission policy is misleading. Open enrollment customarily refers to policies guaranteeing unlimited acceptance of all students who apply, regardless of the number, and regardless of the capacity of an institution to accommodate them properly.

This is not the case in Connecticut. Each year the General Assembly sets the limit on Community College enrollment in making appropriations for the operation of the system. Furthermore, admission to a Community College does not guarantee admission to every program offered within the institutions. Requirements for admission to specific programs vary, and students are accepted only in those programs for which they are qualified.

Transfer. Comments based on the reactions of a few staff are unfortunately referred to as if they reflect Board policy. Reference here is to the comment on the privacy of student records. Certainly, this must be respected; but this in no way has altered the Board's policy and desire to have yearly follow-up of transfer students. In Part A of these comments, under Recommendation 10, we note that research on transfer is a clearcut function of a staff position in the central office, and excellent progress was underway until the staff person was loaned to the Commission for Higher Education in accordance with P.A. 194 (1972), and to the State Board for Academic Awards. In May, 1974, this person accepted a position with the State Board for Academic Awards. Our vacant position will be filled, and the transfer studies resumed.

Community Services. We concur that the mission of the Community Colleges in this area needs (1) clarification in legislative acts, (2) considerably more funding, (3) more recognition of the need for by the Commission for Higher Education, and (4) more emphasis by the colleges, which we believe can be and will be achieved with more financial support plus a change in funding which clearly does not relate all instructional costs to a credit hour or FTE student funding method.

In fairness to staff, the Board must state that it believes comments 1 and 3 are different from the belief of the central office staff. The regions or communities served by the colleges vary extensively. Only very general concepts and guidelines are practical. Many hours in the past few years have been spent by the Executive Director and the presidents collectively and singly in exploring community service possibilities.

Also, the report has reached an incorrect conclusion when it refers to a "token effort" in the area of community services by referring to the percent of time central office staff spends in various categories. Within the categories of research, program development and planning, and coordination among the colleges are many hours and days each year devoted to community services. One position in the central office is nearly exclusively devoted to this. The Executive Director spends time within these categories on community service operations and planning as does the Academic Officer.

Combining the Community Colleges and Technical College Boards. The report fails to make clear that the Executive Director of the Board of Trustees of Regional Community Colleges and the Board itself have believed strongly in the need to have one governing board for the Technical Colleges and the Community Colleges. Our Board has encouraged and sought cooperation between the Technical and Community Colleges and will continue to do so. It is certainly open to further sincere effort to explore this possible combining of the two types of colleges under one Board.

Counseling and Remedial Programs. The figures cited for counselors overall show a reasonable relationship pertaining to enrollment and the make-up of the student populations. We agree that the colleges need more counselors.

In regard to remedial programs, without doubt more should and can be done. But we suggest caution be used in listing the number of staff in this area by college, and if such is done, it should be done after a thorough analysis of the educational level of the entering student at the colleges. No such analysis was made for this report, nor has it been done in the Community Colleges. Again, we are hopeful that by 1976 we can use computers to make such studies.

Part-time Faculty. Many Community Colleges' programs and community services require courses of a specialized nature for which there are people in the region better equipped to teach than regular, full-time faculty, plus the fact that only one section or two is needed, not enough to employ a person full-time. Therefore, to have the flexibility needed and to be responsive to community needs full-time faculty are not practical and are not always needed to insure quality.

The Executive Director has checked the 80%/20% guideline with the executive office for the regional accrediting association, which has found it acceptable. All colleges are moving toward it.

Health Care. Not revealed in the comments about health care are previous difficulties in getting health care positions approved by other State agencies. It is stated there is "no apparent reason why some colleges spend a great deal

more than others on health care. . ." There are reasons. Some requests to have more health care positions were rejected or delayed. Therefore, despite the desires of the colleges, they were never implemented, or in view of the limited operating funds, presidents have determined funds available should be used for a reading specialist or a counselor or a key faculty position for a new program rather than for a nurse. We know that every one of the Community College presidents wish to have an adequate health care program on their campuses. We believe our colleges should have health care services on campus. We do not believe that having an arrangement for emergency service with a local hospital is adequate. Many of our students need to presence of a nurse on campus to confer about health problems and to assist them in securing medical advice.

Additional copies of any of the Reports produced by the Program Review Committee may be obtained by contacting Mr. George L. Schroeder, Director, Program Review Committee, Room 402, State Capitol, Hartford, Connecticut - 06115

Connecticut General Assembly

Summary Of
Program Review Committee
Report On
Community Colleges In The State Of Connecticut

July, 1974

INTRODUCTION

The community college system is a new educational institution in Connecticut. The concept, which opens public education at the thirteenth and fourteenth grade levels to any citizen who has successfully completed the first twelve, is firmly embedded in most states across the nation, despite the relatively short history of "open enrollment" in our country.

That the program is beneficial there can be no doubt. The doors to opportunity have been opened for an untold number of people, both young and not-so-young, in this country and in this state.

However, identifiable problems are beginning to emerge, and it is the purpose of this report to deal with these issues, proposing viable solution where possible.

The difficulties besetting the community college system fall into two types. Both of these types are caused by a confusion of roles on the part of the policy-making organizations involved: the individual colleges, the central office, the Board of Trustees, the Commission for Higher Education, the Executive Department, and the General Assembly itself.

The roles of each of these bodies have not been clearly defined. Responsibilities, accountability, and

areas of authority have never been sufficiently spelled out. This has resulted in different interpretations by the various interested parties.

This lack of clarity for responsibility, accountability, and authority is the underlying cause of the two basic types of problems confronting the system:

(1) Conflict: When two agencies think they each have responsibility and authority for a single function.

The prime example of this is the ongoing struggle between the colleges and the Office of Finance and Control over who has the basic responsibility for, and should make the decisions regarding, expenditures. We found this conflict to be damaging to the system in terms of slowing down and impeding services.

(2) Inaction: When no one steps forth and assumes responsibility and authority for a function.

Examples of this are the wide divergencies among the colleges in services offered in the areas of guidance, remediation, community service (which is one of the three legislative mandates) and health services for students.

The following is a summary of the major findings of the study with the Committee's recommendations as to what actions should be taken.

Findings:

1. Governance of the community college system is subject to confusions and outside intervention. In some cases this is caused by statutory mandates that are unclear. In others, statutory mandates overlap between agencies.

....Pages 11-30.

2. Current controls over the amount, propriety, and timing of expenditures of state funds seem to be adequate.

....Pages 18-21.

3. Policy decisions as to the way in which the community college system may expend its appropriations are currently being interfered with or actually made by expenditure control agencies (such as the Department of Finance and Control) whose authorities are widespread and loosely defined.

....Pages 20-21

4. Several state, federal, and private agencies and organizations have called for the modification or termination of these expenditure (pre-audit) controls.

....Pages 23-25.

5. The Program Review Committee has found that these

expenditure controls create governance problems in that they:

1 - Often countervene statutory authorities;

2 - Often result in educational decisions being made by non-educational personnel;

3 - Are not applied consistently;

4 - Create time lags and reduce flexibility;

5 - Can easily become arbitrary or political in nature; and

6 - Are not really efficient or economical.

....Pages 25-26.

6. The Program Review Committee also found several beneficial aspects to an expenditure control system in that:

1 - Control agencies often have a broader, state-wide view of planning and budgeting than requesting agencies;

2 - Expenditure controls provide an additional check on agency overexpenditures; and

3 - Such a system provides for monitored spending during periods of economic uncertainty.

....Page 26.

7. The major weaknesses of the present system are caused by:

1 - A lack of clearly mandated authorities;

2 - A lack of standard procedures; and

3 - A lack of communication between control agencies and requesting agencies.

....Pages 27-29.

Recommendations:

1. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD PASS LEGISLATION THAT CLEARLY DEFINES THE AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR ACTIVITIES UNDER THIS LEGISLATION.

....Page 29

2. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD CLEARLY DEFINE THE AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS AND HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE FOR THESE ACTIVITIES.

....Page 29.

3. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD PASS LEGISLATION CLEARLY DEFINING THE AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONTROL AGENCIES.

....Page 29.

4. IN KEEPING WITH THE AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES MANDATED, THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND CONTROL SHOULD ISSUE CLEAR AND CONCISE STANDARD REGULATIONS TO ALL STATE AGENCIES, INDICATING THE WAY IN WHICH

ALL REQUESTS ARE PROCESSED AND THE CRITERIA NECESSARY FOR COMPLETED REQUESTS.

....Page 29.

4A. THESE REGULATIONS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO THE LEGISLATIVE REGULATIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE FOR APPROVAL IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS MEET THE STANDARDS NECESSARY FOR EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND ECONOMICAL GOVERNANCE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM.

....Page 29.

5. IN THE EVENT THAT A DECISION MADE BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES WILL HAVE AN IMPACT ON AN INTER-REGIONAL OR STATEWIDE BASIS, THE BOARD SHOULD BE NOTIFIED TO THAT EFFECT BY THE APPROPRIATE CONTROL AGENCY.

....Page 29.

5A. SUCH NOTIFICATION SHOULD INCLUDE A COMPLETE DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS AS SEEN BY THE CONTROL AGENCY AND/OR OTHER APPROPRIATE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES AND CITIZEN GROUPS.

....Pages 29-30.

6. OPERATIONS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM AND THE CONTROL AGENCIES SHOULD BE CONDUCTED WITH MAXIMUM POSSIBLE COMMUNICATION AND COOPERATION AMONG THEM.

....Page 30.

7. ANY CONTROL AGENCY DISAPPROVAL SHALL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A COMPLETE EXPLANATION OF THE REASONS FOR THE DISAPPROVAL.

....Page 30.

Findings:

8. The three missions of the community college system are college transfer, occupational training, and community service.

....Pages 31-33.

9. These missions are not clearly defined in the General Statutes.

....Pages 31-33.

Recommendations:

8. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD REPEAL SECTION 10-326(3) OF THE GENERAL STATUTES AND SUBSTITUTE CLEAR, CONCISE, AND MEANINGFUL DEFINITIONS OF THE MISSIONS OF THE REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM.

....Page 33.

13. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD PASS LEGISLATION CLEARLY DEFINING THE COMMUNITY SERVICE MISSION OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

....Page 51.

Findings:

10. Transfer programs are currently emphasized due to this lack of statutory definition, the traditional view of the role of community colleges, the comparative expense of occupational programs and a lack of meaningful operational guidelines from the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges as to the colleges' role in implementing these missions.

....Pages 31-38.

Recommendations:

9. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD PROVIDE CLEAR AND MEANINGFUL GUIDELINES FOR THE COLLEGES TO HELP THEM DETERMINE THEIR ROLE IN THE STATE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM, ESPECIALLY IN REGARD TO ASSIGNING PRIORITY AMONG THE COLLEGES' MISSIONS AND DETERMINING WHAT PROGRAMS ARE APPROPRIATE FOR CARRYING OUT THE VARIOUS MISSIONS.

....Page 34.

14. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHOULD ISSUE SUCH GUIDELINES AND REGULATIONS CONCERNING COMMUNITY SERVICES AS ARE NECESSARY TO ENSURE THAT THIS MISSION IS FULFILLED.

....Page 51.

Findings:

11. Evaluation of the success or failure of the community college system to fulfill its missions is difficult due to lack of meaningful information on transfer students, occupational graduates and community service programs.

....Pages 35-50.

Recommendations:

11. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHOULD ENSURE THAT THE NECESSARY FOLLOW-UP AND OTHER APPROPRIATE INFORMATION ON TRANSFER, OCCUPATION, AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS BE AVAILABLE FOR DECISION MAKING.

....Page 43.

Findings:

12. The lack of a formal transfer system among the constituent units of higher education in Connecticut results in loss of credit in some cases of transfer within the state system.

....Pages 37-38.

Recommendations:

10. THE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION SHOULD INSTITUTE A UNIFORM TRANSFER SYSTEM FOR THE

CONTITUENT UNITS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATE. THIS SYSTEM SHOULD MANDATE TRANSFER REQUIREMENTS AND DEFINE THE GENERAL STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF COURSES TO THE SATISFACTION OF ALL CONSTITUENT SUB-SYSTEMS OF THE STATE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM.

....Page 38.

Findings:

13. Occupational training programs are generally of high quality despite poor equipment, limited usable space and little central planning and coordination.

....Page 39.

14. There are substantial similarities between the missions of the Regional Community Colleges and the State Technical Colleges. A combination of the governance of these two systems would provide for less duplication of effort and a more efficient two-year college system.

....Pages 40-42.

Recommendations:

12. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD PASS LEGISLATION COMBINING THE BOARDS OF TRUSTEES FOR REGIONAL

COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND FOR STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGES.

....Page 43.

Findings:

15. The administration of community service programs is hampered by a lack of coordination within the system.

....Page 45.

Recommendations:

15. THE INDIVIDUAL COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSESSING COMMUNITY NEEDS AND DESIGNING PROGRAMS TO MEET THESE NEEDS.

....Page 51.

15A. THESE DECISIONS SHOULD BE MADE WITH THE INPUT OF ALL APPROPRIATE ADVISORY GROUPS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS.

....Page 51.

Findings:

16. The current system of funding community colleges on an enrollment basis does not take into account such factors as fixed costs and the greater cost of programs which require special equipment and

small class sizes. This results in an overemphasis on courses that require little equipment and can accommodate large numbers of students and relatively little emphasis on special programs (occupational, community service, remedial) and other services or facilities (libraries, etc.).

....Pages 52-58.

Recommendations:

16. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD ALTER THE METHOD OF FUNDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO PROVIDE FOR DESIGNATED APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FOLLOWING EIGHT BROAD CATEGORIES:

    1. LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS
    2. PLANT MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS
    3. STUDENT SERVICES
    4. ADMINISTRATION AND GENERAL EXPENSES
    5. COMMUNITY SERVICES
    6. GUIDANCE
    7. REMEDIATION
    8. INSTRUCTION

....Page 58.

16A. ENROLLMENT FIGURES SHOULD BE USED ONLY AS A BASIS FOR FUNDING INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS.

....Page 58.

16B. OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS SHOULD BE FUNDED AT A HIGHER LEVEL THAN COLLEGE TRANSFER AND GENERAL PROGRAMS. THESE LEVELS SHOULD REALISTICALLY REFLECT COST DIFFERENTIALS, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT SUCH FACTORS AS CLASS SIZE AND EQUIPMENT COSTS.

....Pages 58-59.

16C. A THIRD LEVEL OF FUNDING COULD BE UTILIZED FOR SUPPORTING HEALTH SERVICES OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS IF NECESSARY.

....Page 59.

Findings:

17. Funding based on the recommendation above would provide greater accountability and legislative control of the level of support for different program areas and services.

....Pages 59-60.

18. Open enrollment admissions policies, one of the major premises upon which community college operations are based (see Chapter I), create the need for special services for the non-traditional student such as intensive counseling and remediation.

....Pages 61-65.

19. Current inadequacies in the counseling and remedial functions are caused, at least in part, by a lack of meaningful information and research in these areas, a lack of operational guidelines and a lack of evaluation of ongoing programs.

....Pages 61-62.

Recommendations:

17. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHOULD ESTABLISH AND MANDATE CRITERIA FOR THE MINIMUM LEVEL OF COUNSELING NEEDED AT EACH INSTITUTION. THESE CRITERIA SHOULD BE BASED ON THE COLLECTION OF MEANINGFUL INFORMATION FROM THE COLLEGES, PROGRAM EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH AND INFORMATION FROM OTHER STATES AND APPROPRIATE SOURCES.

....Page 62.

Findings:

20. Remedial programs, especially in reading, are often necessary because a high school diploma no longer guarantees that a student is able to read at a level necessary for success in college.

....Pages 63-65.

Recommendations:

18. ALL HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS IN THE STATE SHOULD

BE GIVEN A STANDARIZED READING EXAMINATION, ADMINISTERED BY THE STATE.

STUDENTS WHO ACHIEVE AT LEAST AN EIGHTH GRADE READING LEVEL SHOULD BE AWARDED A CERTIFICATE SO STATING.

SUCH A CERTIFICATE SHOULD BE REQUIRED FOR FULL-TIME ADMISSION TO ANY COMMUNITY COLLEGE, IN ADDITION TO THE HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA PRESENTLY REQUIRED.

....Page 65.

18A. EACH ENTERING STUDENT, FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME, SHOULD BE TESTED FOR READING ABILITY. THOSE NOT OBTAINING AT LEAST A TENTH GRADE READING LEVEL SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO TAKE REMEDIAL COURSES TO BRING THEM UP TO THAT LEVEL.

....Page 65.

Findings:

21. Community college faculties appear to be competent and dedicated. Complaints about financial compensation and the promotion system do not seem to have brought about a high attrition rate. The implementation of the new personnel policies manual being formulated by the Board of Trustees should alleviate the major problems in current

faculty evaluation and promotion.

....Pages 66-68.

22. The Program Review Committee is concerned, as is the Board of Trustees, with the large percentage of part-time faculty employed by the system. Though it is more economical to utilize part-time faculty, they are unable to provide as much student consultation and counseling or take as great a part in curriculum development as can full-time personnel. The implementation of guidelines proposed by the Executive Director of the Board of Trustees should alleviate this problem.

....Pages 67-68.

23. The Board of Trustees has not implemented its goals for providing health services at the community colleges. In addition, the central office has little usable information as to what services are being offered and their cost.

....Pages 69-71

Recommendations:

19. EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE SHOULD DEVELOP A HEALTH SERVICE PROGRAM WHICH PROVIDES FOR

(1) IMMEDIATE AVAILABILITY OF A REGISTERED NURSE, AND (2) AVAILABILITY OF A PHYSICIAN ON CALL FOR MEDICAL EMERGENCIES.

....Page 71.

20. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHOULD ENSURE THAT ADEQUATE FUNDING, PERSONNEL, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, AND EQUIPMENT ARE AVAILABLE TO MEET THIS NEED.

....Page 71.

Findings:

24. The lack of day care facilities at most community colleges makes it difficult for many prospective students to attend.

....Pages 71-73.

Recommendations:

21. PROGRAMS WHICH WOULD ENABLE A WIDE RANGE OF PEOPLE, INCLUDING STUDENTS WITH YOUNG CHILDREN, TO ENROLL IN COLLEGES SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED AT EACH COLLEGE.

....Page 73.

Findings:

25. Facilities at the community colleges are not of uniform quality. Some are unsafe, others cannot

be used during the day (public high school buildings) and many are inadequate due to lack of space or needed facilities. The General Assembly has taken the first step toward improving this situation by appropriating 20 million dollars for the purchase and improvement of community college facilities.

....Pages 74-75.

Recommendations:

22. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHOULD ENSURE THAT ALL COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITIES ARE ADEQUATE FOR THE COLLEGES' NEEDS AND ARE SAFE FOR OCCUPANCY. SPECIAL ATTENTION SHOULD BE PAID TO IMPROVING FACILITIES AT THOSE SCHOOLS WHICH ARE HOUSED IN INFERIOR FACILITIES IN AN EFFORT TO EQUALIZE THE QUALITY AND SAFETY OF ALL COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITIES.

....Page 75.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 16 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Additional copies of any of the Reports produced by the Program Review Committee may be obtained by contacting Mr. George L. Schroeder, Director, Program Review Committee, Room 402, State Capitol, Hartford, Connecticut - 06115